

The Final Years of Samaria (730-720 BC)

Uncertainty and controversy over the course of events during Samaria's final years continue in spite of extensive biblical and non-biblical texts related to the topic⁽¹⁾. The main disputed issues concern the date and nature of the Assyrian takeover of Samaria, whether the city was captured on only one or on more occasions and by which Assyrian ruler(s), when Samaria was provincialized, and the course of the reign of King Hoshea and the governing of Samaria following his arrest. In this paper, we shall argue (1) that the Israelites were forced to submit to the Assyrians on four different occasions in the 720s; (2) that Shalmaneser V ravaged Samaria in 725-724 BCE and at the same time arrested Hoshea, looted the temple at Bethel, and declared Samaria an Assyrian province; (3) that the Israelites subsequently rebelled, enthroned a new king (whose name remains unknown), and established a new sanctuary in Samaria before surrendering to the Assyrians just before Shalmaneser's death; and (4) that Sargon II had to retake the city during his second regnal year after Samaria had again revolted.

I. The Appointment of Hoshea

Biblical texts date the Assyrian siege and capture of Samaria to the seventh and ninth years of King Hoshea's rule (2 Kgs 17,6; 18,9-10). If we knew the exact chronology of Hoshea's reign, this would make it possible to determine the years to which the biblical editors assigned the city's siege and capture. The chronology of Hoshea's reign, however, depends upon determining the time he

⁽¹⁾ For recent general surveys of the issues see H. TADMOR, "The Campaigns of Sargon II of Assur: A Chronological-historical Study", *JCS* 12 (1958) 22-40, 77-100; E. J. H. BECKING, *De Ondergang van Samaria* (dissertation; Utrecht 1985); J. HUGHES, *Secrets of the Times: Myth and History in Biblical Chronology* (JSOTSS 66; Sheffield 1990) 203-209; N. NA'AMAN, "The Historical Background to the Conquest of Samaria (720 BC)", *Bib* 71 (1990) 206-225.

assumed the throne and from when his regnal years were calculated. Both Assyrian and biblical texts refer to Hoshea's rise to the throne but there is scholarly disagreement concerning the chronology of Hoshea's reign.

Two of Tiglath-pileser III's inscriptions related to his 734-731 western campaigns refer to the Assyrian king's designation or recognition of Hoshea as king⁽²⁾. III R 10, 2:17-18 reports that "Pekah their king they (the Israelites) deposed and Hoshea [for king]ship over them I appointed"⁽³⁾. Lines 10-11 (reverse) of ND4301 + 4305 may be reconstructed to read "...Hoshea as ki]ng over them [I appointed]...to Sarribanu before me..."⁽⁴⁾. Borger and Tadmor have rightly assumed that line 11 refers to Hoshea's payment of tribute. III R 10, 2:17-18 and ND4301 + 4305: rev. 10-11 indicate that Tiglath-pileser recognized Hoshea as king, during one of his three western campaigns conducted in 734-733 to 732-731. The recognition occurred probably before Tiglath-pileser left Syria-Palestine after his second campaign against Damascus which occurred in 732-731 according to the Eponym Chronicle. 2 Kgs 16,10aa reports that King Ahaz of Judah met with the Assyrian ruler in Damascus after the Syrian king Rezin had been put to death. Ahaz may have attended a general meeting at which time Tiglath-pileser established political boundaries and made final arrangements for the vassal states and Assyrian provinces in Syria-Palestine. Hoshea was probably recognized as the new monarch over Beth Omri at the time, but did not yet possess his kingdom.

That Pekah still held Samaria at the time the Assyrian monarch withdrew from the region is indicated by four factors. First, in his annals, Tiglath-pileser notes that "Samaria alone I [le]ft...their

(2) For a recent treatment of the Assyrian texts related to the period, see S. A. IRVINE, *Isaiah, Ahaz, and the Syro-Ephraimitic Crisis* (SBLDS 123; Atlanta 1990) 23-72.

(3) The text was originally published in H. C. RAWLINSON, *Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia* (5 vols.; London 1861-1909) 3. pl. 10, no. 2 and a translation in G. SMITH, *Assyrian Discoveries* (London 1876) 284-285.

(4) The text, discovered in the 1955 excavations at Nimrud, was published by D. J. WISEMAN, "A Fragmentary Inscription of Tiglath-pileser III from Nimrud", *Iraq* 18 (1956) 117-129. The reading *Sarribanu* was proposed by R. BORGER-H. TADMOR, "Zwei Beiträge zur alttestamentliche Wissenschaft aufgrund der Inschriften Tiglathpilesers III", *ZAW* 94 (1982) 244-251.

king..." (Layard 66:228)⁽⁵⁾. Although the text here reads URU *Samirina* ("the city of Samaria") more than the city itself may be involved. The Assyrian scribes were perhaps not consistent in their use of determinatives. In Tiglath-pileser's inscriptions reference is made to both *Menihimme* URU *Samerina* ("Menahem of the city of Samaria") and to *Menihimme* KUR *Samerina* ("Menahem of the land of Samaria"). Pekah would have remained in power as long as he held Samaria securely and Tiglath-pileser notes that Samaria was not attacked by the Assyrians. Second, that Hoshea sent tribute to Tiglath-pileser while the latter was away from the capital on campaign (ND4301 + 4305: rev.10-11) rather than delivering it personally while the Assyrian king was in Syria-Palestine or else sending it to the Assyrian capital indicates that Hoshea only gained control of Samaria after Tiglath-pileser had left the region and that he paid tribute in haste once he secured full control of the country. Third, Hiram of Tyre, Queen Samsi of Arabia, and Hannun of Gaza were all left on their thrones in spite of having joined the anti-Assyrian coalition but each offered at least token submission to Tiglath-pileser. Nothing is ever said in the Assyrian texts about Pekah's submission; this fact suggests that he remained unrepentant. Fourth, 2 Kgs 15,30, in agreement with III R 10, 2:17-18, notes it was Hoshea and his supporters, not the Assyrians, who attacked Pekah and executed him⁽⁶⁾.

Hoshea's payment of tribute to Tiglath-pileser at Sarrabanu probably occurred after Hoshea had gained control over Samaria and thus officially had replaced Pekah as king. Only with control of the capital city would he have gained access to the state and royal

⁽⁵⁾ Published in P. ROST, *Die Keilschrifttexte Tiglat-Pileasers III nach den Papierabklatschen und Originalen des Britischen Museums* (Leipzig 1893) pls. XXII-XXIII, pp. 35-41.

⁽⁶⁾ Hos 2,2 probably refers to the co-operative effort of Hoshea and King Ahaz of Judah to overthrow Pekah. (Note the positive evaluation of Hoshea in 2 Kgs 17,2b.) Deut 32,1-43 was probably composed to encourage and justify the killing of Pekah and his supporters to purge the land; see J.H. CHONG, *The Song of Moses (Deuteronomy 32:1-43) and the Hoshea-Pekah Conflict* (dissertation; Emory 1990). The wording of 2 Kgs 15,30, that Hoshea "attacked him and put him to death" (or "executed him") suggests an assault on Pekah followed by his being put to death. The terms used no more express the mere idea of a personal assassination than does the reference in 2 Kgs 16,9 which states that Tiglath-pileser "put Rezin to death".

treasuries. Exactly when Hoshea paid tribute is somewhat uncertain. Although the exact location of Sarrabanu is unknown, the city lay somewhere in southern Mesopotamia. Tiglath-pileser campaigned in this area in 731-730 (Eponym Chronicle = “against Sapiya”) and again in 729-728 (Babylonian Chronicles, 1.i.19-23)⁽⁷⁾. Thus Hoshea may have paid his initial tribute in either of these years. In all probability, the defeat of Pekah’s forces and the capture of Samaria took some time to accomplish. Nonetheless, the earlier date seems the more likely.

In light of the chronological references given for Hoshea’s reign, 729 appears too late a date. According to 2 Kgs 17,1, Hoshea began to rule in the twelfth year of Ahaz’s reign (743-728) which would have been 732-731. This coincides with the year of Tiglath-pileser’s third western campaign⁽⁸⁾. If the synchronism and the proposed dates for Ahaz are correct, then the biblical text suggests that Tiglath-pileser could have appointed Hoshea as ruler prior to departing the region. Since the regnal years of Israelite kings seem to have been counted from the fall (Marheshvan)⁽⁹⁾ new year festival, subsequent synchronisms between Hoshea and Hezekiah (2 Kgs 18,9-10) imply that Hoshea had not deposed Pekah until after Marheshvan 731, that is, until Tiglath-pileser was already campaigning in Babylonia. Hoshea’s first regnal year would have been calculated from Marheshvan 730.

II. Shalmaneser V and Samaria

Non-biblical texts regarding Shalmaneser’s reign (726-722) are limited to statements in the Eponym Chronicle, a short section in the Babylonian Chronicles (1.i.27-30), and Josephus’s reproduction of Menander’s quotations from the Tyrian archives (*Ant.* 9.283-87).

(7) See A. K. GRAYSON, *Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles* (Locust Valley 1925) 72. No reference is made in the chronicles to Tiglath-pileser’s 731-730 campaign.

(8) See J. H. HAYES-P. K. HOOKER, *A New Chronology for the Kings of Israel and Judah* (Atlanta 1988) 59-67 on the chronology of Ahaz’s reign.

(9) See 1 Kgs 12,31 and S. TALMON, “The Cult and Calendar Reform of Jeroboam I”, in his *King, Cult and Calendar in Ancient Israel* (Jerusalem 1986) 113-139.

The Eponym Chronicle (K3203) reports the following for the years 728-723 (¹⁰):

- (728-727) Eponym Durassar governor of Tushhan, the king took the hand of Bel. The city Di ...
-
- (727-726) Eponym Belharran-bel-usur governor of Guzana, to the city of ...
Shalmaneser sat on the throne.
- (726-725) Eponym Marduk-bel-usur governor of Ameda, in [the land].
- (725-724) Eponym Mahde governor of Nineveh, to the country of ...
- (724-723) Eponym Assur-ishmeani governor of Kalzi, to ...
- (723-722) Eponym Shalmaneser king of Assyria, to ...

The Babylonian Chronicles (1.i.23-31) contain the following entries for the years 728-722 (¹¹):

- 23 Tiglath-pileser ascended the throne in Babylon.
-
- 24 The second year: Tiglath-pileser died in the month Tebet.
- 25 For (*eighteen*) years Tiglath-pileser ruled Akkad and Assyria.
- 26 For two of these years he ruled in Akkad.
- 27 On the twenty-fifth day of the month Tebet,
- 28 Shalmaneser ascended the throne in Assyria (*and Akkad*). He ravaged the city of Samaria (¹²).
-
- 29 The fifth year: Shalmaneser died in the month Tebet.
- 30 For five years Shalmaneser ruled Akkad and Assyria.
- 31 On the twelfth day of the month Tebet Sargon ascended the throne in Babylon.

In *Ant.* 9.283-287, Josephus reports the following concerning Shalmaneser's relationships to Phoenicia:

And the king of Assyria came with an army and invaded Syria and all of Phoenicia. Now the name of this king is recorded in the Tyrian

(¹⁰) See G. SMITH, "On a New Fragment of the Assyrian Canon Belonging to the Reigns of Tiglath-Pileser and Shalmaneser", *Transactions of the Society of Biblical Archaeology* 2 (1873) 321-332.

(¹¹) See GRAYSON, *Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles*, 72-73.

(¹²) Doubts about reading Samaria (Samara'in) held by earlier scholars can no longer be taken seriously; see TADMOR, "Campaigns of Sargon II", 39-40 and NA'AMAN, "Historical Background", 215-216.

archives, for he marched upon Tyre in the reign of Elulaios. This is also attested by Menander, the author of a book of Annals and translator of the Tyrian archives into the Greek language, who has given the following account: "And Elulaios, to whom they gave the name of Pyas, reigned thirty-six years. This king, upon the revolt of the Kitieis (Cyprians), put out to sea and again reduced them to submission. During his reign Selampsas, the king of Assyria, came with an army and invaded all Phoenicia and, after making a treaty of peace with all (its cities), withdrew from the land. And Sidon and Arke and old Tyre and many other cities also revolted from Tyre and surrendered to the king of Assyria. But, as the Tyrians for that reason would not submit to him, the king turned back again and attacked them after the Phoenicians had furnished him with sixty ships and eight hundred oarsmen. Against these the Tyrians sailed with twelve ships and, after dispersing the ships of their adversaries, took five hundred of their men prisoners. On that account, in fact, the price of everything went up in Tyre. But the king of Assyria, on retiring, placed guards at the river and the aqueducts to prevent the Tyrians from drawing water, and this they endured for five years, and drank from wells which they had dug". This, then, is what is written in the Tyrian archives concerning Salmanasses, the king of Assyria (LCL translation).

Before attempting to integrate the evidence of these non-biblical texts and to correlate it with biblical texts, a special feature of the Babylonian Chronicles must be noted. In Babylonian Chronicle 1, horizontal lines in the text serve to organize the reported events chronologically. Most scholars have ignored the fact that the horizontal line between the statement on the destruction of Samaria and the statement about the fifth year of the king's reign indicates that Samaria was ravaged by Shalmaneser at some time prior to the final year of his rule (722-721). One scholar who has noted the importance of these transverse chronological markers is Na'aman but he wrongly interprets the evidence. He states that "the text of the chronicle is organized throughout in a chronological order, with each and every event accurately dated within a specific year of the king of Babylonia and a transverse line marked to separate the years of reign". He further concludes that "the 'ravaging' of Samara'in is included within the accession year of Shalmaneser and should accordingly be assigned to that year"⁽¹³⁾. This makes the chronicle

⁽¹³⁾ NA'AMAN, "Historical Background", 210. Na'aman quotes Hugo Winckler who argued that the assignment of the destruction to the accession year indicated that one should read Sabara'in rather than

much more exact than is the case. The material between the horizontal markers following line 23 and preceding line 29 cover a period which includes the final year of Tiglath-pileser (727-726) as well as the accession year of Shalmaneser V (727-726) plus the first four years of his reign (726-725 to 723-722). The only event reported for Shalmaneser during these years is the ravaging of Samaria. Thus one can draw two and only two conclusions about the history of Samaria from this Babylonian chronicle: (1) the city was ravaged by Shalmaneser and (2) this occurred prior to his fifth year, that is, before 722-721.

The entries in the Eponym Chronicle for the last two years of Tiglath-pileser, unfortunately fragmentary, indicate rebellion in the west. The reference to "the city Di...", in the entry for 728-727, no doubt refers to the city of Damascus (see the entries for 733-732 and 732-731). That this text probably referred to a revolt by Damascus receives indirect support from II R 67 (K3751): rev. 14-16 and ND4301 + 4305: rev. 27-29. The former text reports on Tiglath-pileser's deposal of Uassurme of Tabal and his replacement by Hulli and the receipt of tribute exacted through the threat of force from Metenna of Tyre (in 728 or 727)⁽¹⁴⁾. The latter text mentions a ruler who failed to pay proper homage to Tiglath-pileser, probably

Samara'in; see WINCKLER's "Nachtrag", *ZA* 2 (1887) 351-352 and *Die Keilschrifttexte und das Alte Testament* (ed. E. SCHRADER) (Berlin ³1903) 62. Dalley argues exactly the opposite: "According to the Babylonian Chronicle, the capture of Samaria took place at the very end of Shalmaneser's reign" (S. DALLEY, "Foreign Chariotry and Cavalry in the Armies of Tiglath-pileser III and Sargon II", *Iraq* 47 [1985] 33). Decades ago, Olmstead pointed out that the capture of Samaria "is mentioned as the only event in Shalmaneser's reign, just before the account of his death and just after that of his accession. So far, then, as the Chronicle is concerned, we can only place it in his reign, that is, within the years 727-722" (A. T. OLMSTEAD, "The Fall of Samaria", *AJSL* 21 [1904-05] 181). Olmstead, however, failed to grasp the chronological significance of the horizontal line which places the ravaging of Samaria prior to the death year (722-721) of Shalmaneser.

⁽¹⁴⁾ The text appears in RAWLINSON, *Cuneiform Inscriptions*, 2, pl. 67 and ROST, *Keilschrifttexte*, 55-77 and in translation in SMITH, *Assyrian Discoveries*, 254-66 and D. D. LUCKENBILL, *Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia* (2 vols.; Chicago 1926-27) 1. §§ 786-804. For a study of the text, see A. T. OLMSTEAD, *Assyrian Historiography: A Source Study* (Columbia, MO 1916) 32-35.

Uassurme of Tabal, and a son of a nobody placed on the throne, probably Hulli⁽¹⁵⁾. Thus Tiglath-pileser was having trouble with both Tabal and Tyre and probably Damascus by 728-727.

The expedition noted in the entry for 727-726 is probably best related to Assyrian troubles in the west. Although undertaken by Tiglath-pileser, the expedition may have been continued by Shalmaneser, who replaced his father on 25 Tebet, only a little over two months prior to the time he would have needed to be in the capital for the Nisan new year festival. Josephus reports that Shalmaneser “came with an army and invaded all Phoenicia and, after making peace with all (its cities), withdrew from the land” (*Ant.* 9.284). Certainly, Shalmaneser had no time to learn of the revolt, organize and carry out a western campaign, and defeat both Israel and Tyre after his father’s death in the two months of his accession year, as is argued by Na’aman⁽¹⁶⁾. The new king may have completed a campaign already begun but Shalmaneser would have returned to the capital for his coronation in Nisan. The Eponym Chronicle reports that no expedition occurred in 726-725, Shalmaneser’s first regnal year, for the king was “in [the land]”.

In the biblical account of the last years of the northern kingdom (2 Kgs 17,1-6; 18,9-11)⁽¹⁷⁾, Shalmaneser is said to have come up against, that is, campaigned against Hoshea, who submitted and became his vassal paying tribute to the Assyrian monarch (17,3). The description of this campaign in the biblical text

(15) See WISEMAN, “Fragmentary Inscription”, 122.

(16) “Historical Background”, 212-216. Na’aman argues that the initial action of Shalmaneser against Hoshea (2 Kgs 17,3) and the general revolt in the west occurred at “the time of unrest that followed the death of Tiglath-pileser III” (213).

(17) Rather than reading 2 Kgs 17,3-6 as a continuous sequential narrative, several scholars assume the existence of two parallel accounts deriving from different archives. This one episode-two source theory traces vv. 3-4 to northern archives and vv. 5-6 (plus 18,9-11) to Judean archives. First proposed by Winckler (“Beiträge zur Quellenscheidung der Königsbücher”, *Alttestamentliche Untersuchungen* [Leipzig 1892] 16-25), the theory has been recently defended by G. H. JONES, *1 and 2 Kings* (NCB; London-Grand Rapids 1984) 542-543 and BECKING, *Ondergang van Samaria*, 25-33. Such source division allows one to see the arrest of Hoshea as occurring simultaneously with the capture of Samaria after a three-year siege. There is nothing in the text, however, that would indicate different sources.

would not lead one to presume that much if any conflict occurred between the Israelites and the Assyrians. The text however clearly implies that Hoshea had revolted, that is, failed to pay tribute and that the Assyrian king marched against him. The text certainly does not depict any events which would imply the ravaging of Samaria as is presumed by Na'aman, whose conclusion is based on a misunderstanding of the Babylonian Chronicle.

The most plausible interpretation of both the biblical and non-biblical evidence appears to be the following scenario. Before the death of Tiglath-pileser in Tebet 727, rebellion had broken out in the west. Israel and Hoshea had joined this movement in which at least Damascus and Tyre were also involved. In 727-726, Tiglath-pileser began a campaign to suppress the rebellion, a campaign completed by Shalmaneser, who received the submission of the Phoenicians and Hoshea of Israel, at some time between 25 Tebet 727 when he assumed the kingship and the end of Adar 726 when he would have returned home for the new year festival.

Shalmaneser spent his first regnal year (726-725) "in [the land]", that is, the Assyrian king did not go on campaign that year. Shalmaneser's year of military inactivity witnessed renewed rebellion against Assyria in the west. To this period belongs the renewal of rebellion in Phoenicia led by Tyre (*Ant.* 9.285) and Hoshea's embassy to Egypt and withholding of tribute (2 Kgs 17,4a)⁽¹⁸⁾. In 725-724, Shalmaneser, according to the Eponym Chronicle, again went on campaign, and although reference to the destination of the campaign has not survived in the broken text, the west was undoubtedly involved. The actions against Hoshea noted in 2 Kgs 17,4b and against Tyre described in *Ant.* 9.285-287 are best understood in the context of this 725-724 campaign.

With renewed Assyrian military action in the west, Phoenician cities which had temporarily joined Tyre in renewed rebellion capitulated and aided the Assyrians in an unsuccessful naval effort to subdue Tyre. The Assyrians, in spite of the assistance of a Phoenician fleet, had to abandon efforts to conquer Tyre. The island city was placed under a land blockade which endured for five years. If Tyre was blockaded for five years, this would indicate that

⁽¹⁸⁾ The issue of the identity of the much discussed "King So" of Egypt is of only indirect relevance to the present discussion and need not be pursued.

Shalmaneser took action against the city in the first half of his second regnal year (Nisan 725-Nisan 724) since the siege was no doubt lifted with the death of Shalmaneser in Tebet 722/21 when trouble developed in Assyria over Sargon's accession to the throne. On the basis of a fall new year calendar, the blockade, begun before the fall new year festival of 725, lasted for five years (726-725 until 722-721), that is, from a time prior to the new year festival in 725 until after the new year festival in 722.

According to 2 Kgs 17,4b, Hoshea was seized and imprisoned by Shalmaneser. Unfortunately no details nor chronological information are provided by this text. If Shalmaneser took action against Hoshea in conjunction with putting Tyre under siege this would have been in 725. Exactly how Shalmaneser took possession of Hoshea also remains uncertain. That Hoshea surrendered voluntarily seems highly unlikely⁽¹⁹⁾. Hoshea could hardly have expected favorable treatment from Shalmaneser since he was guilty of two wrongdoings—conspiratorial negotiation with another major power and withholding of tribute—and Hoshea already had a past record of rebellion.

If Hoshea did not surrender voluntarily, then he must have been taken in the course of some military conflict. The reference to Shalmaneser's ravaging of Samaria in the Babylonian Chronicle was probably part of a complex of events during which Hoshea was seized and imprisoned. As noted earlier, Shalmaneser's taking of Samaria reported in the Babylonian Chronicle preceded his fifth year thus ruling out 722-721 as a potential date for his ravaging of Samaria. This leaves as the other known potential candidate one of

⁽¹⁹⁾ Many scholars argue that Hoshea surrendered voluntarily. See, most recently, Na'aman who concludes that "when Shalmaneser heard of the conspiracy he sent troops... and ordered the conspirator to appear before him. Hoshea did so" and was arrested ("Historical Background", 218) or J. Hughes who sees all of 2 Kgs 17,3-6 as parts of a single sequence: "Hoshea had asserted Israelite independence from Assyria by withholding his yearly payment of tribute, and had also sought Egyptian support... Shalmaneser V reacted by launching a military campaign against Hoshea, at which point the latter apparently decided to abandon his revolt, and went to offer his submission and pay tribute. This belated offer of submission failed to satisfy Shalmaneser: Hoshea was arrested and Shalmaneser proceeded to lay siege to Samaria..." (*Secrets of the Times*, 205-206).

two encounters with Hoshea, either that noted in 2 Kgs 17,3 or else that referred to in 2 Kgs 17,4b. As noted above, the first episode, in 2 Kgs 17,3, appears to have involved a voluntary submission since Hoshea is said to have resubmitted to Assyrian vassalage and paid tribute and no statement is made which clearly implies any major military encounter.

The arrest of Hoshea was probably part of a sequence of events in 725 which included not only Shalmaneser's ravaging of the Israelite capital but also the provincialization of Samaria and, from the Assyrian point of view, the termination of Israel's independence. The arrest and imprisonment, and perhaps actual or planned exile, of Hoshea was thus only one feature in a larger scenario which included the looting of the royal sanctuary at Bethel. If these events are to be placed in Shalmaneser's 725-724 campaign, then they probably occurred prior to the actions against Tyre. After his punitive actions against Samaria and Bethel, Hoshea was imprisoned probably awaiting exile once Shalmaneser had settled affairs with Tyre.

Obviously, all of these elements in Shalmaneser's treatment of Hoshea and Samaria are not discussed in either 2 Kings or in Assyrian texts. There do, however, appear to be allusions to these events in prophetic texts. In Hos 10,13b-15 the prophet warns his contemporaries of coming hostile action comparable to Shalmaneser's earlier exploits:

- 13 Because you have trusted in your way (or your chariotry), in the strength of your warriors,
- 14 then the alarm of war will arise among your people, and all your fortifications will be destroyed;
- like Shalman(eser)⁽²⁰⁾ destroyed Beth Arbel⁽²¹⁾ on the day of battle, a mother with her children was bashed;

⁽²⁰⁾ Interpreters have identified this Shalman with Shalmaneser III (M. C. ASTOUR, "841 B. C.: The First Assyrian Invasion of Israel", *JAOS* 91 [1971] 383-389), the usurper Shallum in 2 Kgs 15,10-15 (H. L. GINSBERG, "Hosea", *EncJud* 8 [1971] 1010-1024, see 1018), or the Moabite king Salamanu who paid tribute to Tiglath-pileser in 734 according to II R 67 (K3751):10 (H. W. WOLFF, *Hosea* [Hermeneia; Philadelphia 1974] 187-188). Allusion to an event associated with Shalmaneser III, over a century in the past, hardly seems likely since the text seems to imply audience familiarity with the event. Nothing is recorded or known about actions by Shallum or Salamanu which would indicate the prophet was alluding to either of them.

- 15 just as he did to you, O Bethel⁽²²⁾,
because of the wrongfulness of your crime; in the dawn (or
suddenly) the king of Israel was silenced.

In depicting future conditions, the prophet alludes to three past events as analogies: Shalmaneser's vicious destruction of Beth Arbel, his actions against Bethel, and the silencing of the Israelite king. If the silencing of the king in v. 15b refers to Hoshea's imprisonment, then the actions in vv. 14b-15a probably belong to the same complex of events. The destruction of Beth Arbel probably occurred in conjunction with either Shalmaneser's 727-726 or his 725-724 campaign in the west. The actions against Bethel are described in ambiguous terms but if they were carried out concurrently with the removal of Hoshea from office, they probably included the Assyrian confiscation of the cultic paraphernalia from the national sanctuary. Hos 3,4 probably reflects the conditions alluded to in Hos 10,15 since it seems to presuppose both the arrest of Hoshea and the looting of the Bethel sanctuary: "Surely many days the children of Israel shall dwell without king and without prince and without sacrifice and without pillar and without ephod and teraphim" ⁽²³⁾.

Shalmaneser's actions in Samaria in 725 may also be reflected in Isa 32,14:

Surely, the palace lies unattended,
the noise of the city (or royal quarter) is left behind;

Given the historical context of the prophet Hosea, a reference to Shalmaneser V makes plausible sense (see below, note 23).

⁽²¹⁾ Various proposals have been made regarding the identity of the site Beth-Arbel; see H. DONNER, *Israel unter den Völkern* (VTS 11; Leiden 1964) 164-167.

⁽²²⁾ There is no reason to read "O house of Israel" with the LXX. Bethel is textually the best authenticated reading and also the most difficult.

⁽²³⁾ The book of Hosea is arranged in two panels: chaps. 1-3 and 4-14. Within each panel the materials are arranged chronologically. Chaps. 1-3 cover a period from the last years of Jeroboam II (late 750s) until after the arrest of Hoshea (725). The second panel covers from the years of Shallum's coup until the capture of Samaria by Sargon. Chaps. 4-7 derive from the time before King Hoshea's arrest; chaps. 8-9 from the time between Hoshea's arrest and the capture of Samaria in 722; and chaps. 10-14 from the time of Sargon's activity in the west.

the citadel (*ophel*) and the watchtower have become,
 according to the treaty⁽²⁴⁾, denuded spots forever;
 a delightful place for wild asses,
 pasture for flocks.

This text, which certainly cannot be understood as descriptive of Jerusalem at any period in Isaiah's ministry, is best seen as a description of Samaria⁽²⁵⁾. The prophet's employment of perfect tense verbs indicates that the destruction is past not predicted. Such actions as the silencing of the city and palace and the destruction of the military quarters in the town would be expected in conjunction with the removal of a reigning, rebellious monarch.

The arrest of Hoshea, the looting of the state sanctuary at Bethel, and the demolition of the military headquarters in Samaria would point to one conclusion: Shalmaneser's actions represented the Assyrian termination of the state of Israel and the decreed provincialization of the area. To have arrested and imprisoned the reigning king, no doubt with the intention of exiling him, without making political arrangements for the state would have been contrary to general Assyrian policy. When rebellious kings were deposed by the Assyrians, they were either replaced with co-operative monarchs or the area provincialized. Samaria would certainly not have been left to be governed by its military leaders or city elders as is so often assumed. Shalmaneser's actions in 725 are thus best understood as initial steps in the provincialization of Samaria.

According to 2 Kgs 17,4-6 and 18,9-11, the arrest of Hoshea was not the end of Shalmaneser's dealings with Samaria. 2 Kgs 17,4-6⁽²⁶⁾ speak of a campaign against the whole land (of

⁽²⁴⁾ The enigmatic *b'd* is probably to be read *k'd* and *'d* associated with the Akkadian *adû/adê* signifying treaty relations and obligations.

⁽²⁵⁾ On the connections between Isaiah 28-33 and the reign of Hoshea and its aftermath, see J. H. HAYES-S. A. IRVINE, *Isaiah, the Eighth-century Prophet: His Times and His Preaching* (Nashville 1987) 320-370.

⁽²⁶⁾ Most recent interpretations assume that two Assyrian kings have been confused and events telescoped in 2 Kgs 17,5-6. According to M. COGAN-H. TADMOR, *II Kings* (AB 11; Garden City 1988) 197, "two kings of Assyria oversaw the events referred to in v. 6; Shalmaneser V captured Samaria; Sargon II exiled Israel... The present telescoping of events might be as early as the Deuteronomic editing of Kings". NA'AMAN, "Historical Background", 219, is more drastic: "'the king of Assyria' in vv. 3-4 is Shalmaneser whereas the king in vv. 5-6 is Sargon, his successor". The straightforward sense of 2 Kgs 17,3-6 suggests that the same Assyrian king — Shalmaneser — is intended throughout.

Ephraim?), followed by a movement against Samaria, a three-year siege of the city before its capture in Hoshea's ninth year, and the deportation of Israelites. According to 2 Kgs 18,9-11⁽²⁷⁾ the siege of Samaria began in the fourth year of Hezekiah (Tishri 724-Tishri 723) or the seventh year of Hoshea (Marheshvan 724-Marheshvan 723) and the Assyrians captured or took possession of the city in the sixth year of Hezekiah (Tishri 722-Tishri 721) or the ninth year of Hoshea (Marheshvan 722-Marheshvan 721). Since Sargon began his rule on 12 Tebet in Shalmaneser's fifth year (Nisan 722-Nisan 721), Samaria must have fallen or surrendered to the Assyrians in the two-month period extending from the northern new year festival (15 Marheshvan) marking the beginning of Hoshea's ninth year to the 12th of Tebet when Sargon assumed the throne.

If Hoshea was arrested, Bethel looted, parts of Samaria demolished, and the region declared an Assyrian province in 725-724, and yet the city of Samaria had again to be taken by the Assyrians in 722/21 after a three-year siege, a number of questions present themselves. Did Israel reassert its independence in the face of the edict of provincialization? How were the people governed during this period? What compensation was made for the loss of the cultic paraphernalia from the royal sanctuary at Bethel? On these matters, 2 Kgs 17,5-6 and 18,9-11 offer no information. In the book of Hosea, however, the prophet provides a number of allusions which make possible a general reconstruction of the course of events.

(²⁷) There is no reason to assume that the chronological references in 2 Kgs 18,9-10 are secondary calculations. According to COGAN-TADMOR, *II Kings*, 216, the chronology here is as much as three years off; the inaccuracy "derives from the calculation made by the Judahite chronographer of Kings, who did not know that Hoshea's reign ended before the siege began...". According to Na'aman, the calculations in 2 Kgs 17,5b-6a are based on an earlier historical note stating "that Samaria was besieged and conquered by the Assyrians three years *after* its rebellion and the imprisonment of its king. [The Deuteronomistic Historian] mistakenly interpreted the datum to mean that the city fell — after three years of siege — in Hoshea's last year, thus combining his last year with the fall of Samaria...". "The mistaken dates in vv.5-6 were the basis for a later redactor (possibly DtrN) who composed 2 Kgs 18,9-12" which "is worthless for historical reconstruction..." ("Historical Background", 221-222). Tadmor's interpretation is based on his chronological conclusion that Hoshea's reign extended from 732/31 to 724/23. Na'aman's interpretation is used to buttress his theory that only Sargon captured Samaria after the arrest of Hoshea.

The Israelites apparently refused to submit to Assyrian provincialization and rose again in rebellion, probably while Shalmaneser was trying to subjugate Tyre in the summer or early fall of 725. They re-established a monarchy, set up a new government, and established a sanctuary with refashioned cultic paraphernalia, including a golden calf, in the city or the environs of Samaria. These conditions are reflected in Hos 8,4-5a:

They have enthroned a king,
but not with my consent;
they have set up a government,
but I have not recognized it.
Their silver and their gold, they have
fashioned for themselves cultic paraphernalia;
in order that it might be cut down.
It is rejected, your calf, O Samaria;
my anger burns against them.

Although this text is almost universally understood as the prophet's condemnation of (northern) kingship in general and the Israelite fashioning of cultic artifacts for use in idolatrous worship, the text is best understood with reference to a very specific situation⁽²⁸⁾. Practically all modern translations understand the opening of v. 5 to refer to the "setting up of kings" (see *RSV*), however, there is no term for "kings" in the text and the *hiphil* of the verb *mlk* simply means "to make someone king". Hosea was not opposed to kingship in principle nor to the use of cultic paraphernalia (see Hos 3,4 where loss of the king and cultic artifacts is considered a punishment). Only with strained exegesis can this text be seen as a condemnation of the Bethel cult. The golden calf of northern iconography was set up in Bethel (1 Kgs 12,28-33) and no Yahwistic sanctuary in Samaria is ever mentioned in the historical books. The calf of Samaria, mentioned by the prophet (Hos 8,5-6; 10,5), thus probably refers to a replacement image set up in a sanctuary in or near the city of Samaria after the looting of Bethel in 725. Two further factors support the existence of a sanctuary in Samaria in its final days of rebellion. First, in his Nimrud Prism, Sargon notes that he counted as spoil "the gods of their trust" when he captured

⁽²⁸⁾ On the general issues involved in Hosea's understanding of the monarchy, see A. GELSTON, "Kingship in the Book of Hosea", *OTS* 19 (1974) 71-85.

Samaria (Fragment D, col. IV:32; see below). The presence of cultic paraphernalia (= “the gods”) in Samaria when Sargon took the city indicates the presence of a sanctuary. Second, in a letter datable to this period, to be published by H. W. F. Saggs, an Assyrian official reports to the court that he saw a sanctuary in Samaria.

Rebellion in Ephraim and Samaria, accompanied by the establishment of a new monarchical government and the founding of a new cultic center in Samaria, forms the background of Shalmaneser’s actions reported in 2 Kgs 17,5-6 and 18,9-11. The Assyrian king is said to have campaigned against the whole country (2 Kgs 17,5a) and then moved against Samaria placing the city under siege (17,5b). The attack on Ephraim and Samaria occurred, as we have noted, after Tyre was placed under siege, a siege which began before the new year festival in 725. This prior siege of Tyre is reflected in Hos 9,13, where the prophet speaks of a coming time when Ephraim will suffer a similar fate to Tyre:

Ephraim, just as I have seen Tyre
planted on an oasis,
so Ephraim will lead his sons
to the slaughterer.

According to the Kings narrative, the siege of Samaria began in Hoshea’s seventh year (Marheshvan 724-Marheshvan 723). The siege is also said to have begun in the fourth year of Hezekiah (Tishri 724-Tishri 723). If these references are correct the city could have been initially besieged at any time between Marheshvan 724 and Tishri 723. The siege thus may not have begun until Shalmaneser’s fourth year (Nisan 723-Nisan 722). If Hoshea was taken prisoner in the spring or summer of 725, during his fifth year (Marheshvan 726-Marheshvan 725) and the second year of Shalmaneser (Nisan 725-Nisan 724), then the siege did not begin until at least a year and perhaps as much as two years after his imprisonment. This would have allowed sufficient time for the Samaritans to rebel, re-establish a monarchical government, and open a sanctuary in Samaria.

Samaria was taken by, or surrendered to (the verb *lkd* used in 2 Kgs 17,6; 18,10 does not necessarily imply a destruction), the Assyrians in Hoshea’s ninth year, that is, at some time after Marheshvan 722. The length of the siege—one full and parts of two additional regnal years at a minimum—would imply that the Assyrians did not push the attack very vigorously or else that the

Israelites held out tenaciously. Probably the former is more likely. Three factors lend support to this argument. First, the Assyrians were also holding Tyre under siege simultaneously and this would have occupied part of the Assyrian forces. Second, Shalmaneser does not seem personally to have accompanied his troops into battle during his fifth and final year of reign. The eponym entry for this year does not note any campaign undertaken by the king but only mentions that "the foundation of the temple of Nabû was torn up for repairs". Third, when Sargon assumed the throne, he was confronted with serious dissension in the army (see below). Probably a portion of the Assyrian army without Shalmaneser presided over the capture/surrender of Samaria which occurred just prior to the death of Shalmaneser at which time the forces besieging Tyre and Samaria returned home to participate in the turmoil attendant upon Sargon's accession.

Second Kings 17,6 and 18,11 attribute the exiling of Israelites to Shalmaneser. Although practically all scholars assume that the Assyrian king who carried out the deportation mentioned in these verses was Sargon, this finds no support in the biblical text. Sargon almost certainly deported Samaritans as he claims in various texts (see below) but this in no way precludes deportations by Shalmaneser. According to the 2 Kings account, the same king of Assyria who conquered Samaria in Hosea's ninth year also deported "Israel". If the above-proposed reconstruction is correct, and Shalmaneser declared Israel an Assyrian province at the time of Hoshea's arrest in 725, then the deportation of Israelites may have occurred throughout the remainder of Shalmaneser's reign but especially during the years of Samaria's siege. The biblical text, however, contains no explicit reference to the deportation of people living in the city of Samaria itself.

III. Sargon II and Samaria

No explicit reference is made to Sargon II (721-705) in the historical books of the Bible (see Isa 20,1). The "king of Assyria" who settled foreigners in Samaria (2 Kgs 17,24), however, was probably Sargon. Shalmaneser certainly did not have sufficient time to resettle Samaria between its capture and his death nor had he carried out the military campaigns that would have produced foreign exiles to settle in Samaria. For our knowledge of Sargon's relationship to Samaria, we are dependent primarily on the Assyrian king's inscriptions.

Although the Khorsabad annals appear to assign the capture of Samaria to Sargon's accession year⁽²⁹⁾, it is now clear that his first western campaign did not occur before his second regnal year (720-719)⁽³⁰⁾. At the beginning of his reign, Sargon encountered both internal opposition and external rebellion. In the Borowski stela, he notes that he "pardoned and showed mercy on 6,300 guilty Assyrians, settling them in Hamath"⁽³¹⁾. In the Aššur Charter⁽³²⁾, another document from early in his reign, granting or restoring special privileges to the citizens of Aššur, Sargon notes that in his second year he fought Humbanigash, king of Elam, and Yaubi'di of Hamath who headed a western coalition of rebellious powers. Although Sargon claims to have shattered the might of the Elamites, the Babylonian Chronicle reports a different story. At the accession of Sargon, Marduk-apla-iddina (Merodach-baladan) seized the throne in Babylon, occupied by Assyrians since 729, and was aided in his venture by the Elamite kingdom. The Babylonian version of Sargon's battle with the Elamite army backing Marduk-apla-iddina describes it as an Assyrian defeat:

The second year of Marduk-apla-iddina [720-719],
Humban-nikash, king of Elam, did
battle against Sargon, king of Assyria, in
the district of Der, effected an Assyrian
retreat, and inflicted a major defeat
upon them (l.i. 33-35)⁽³³⁾.

Sargon campaigned in the west, only after settling his domestic trouble and after his encounter with Elam. Since his battle with the king of Elam occurred in his second regnal year (720-719), Sargon

⁽²⁹⁾ Becking raises the possibility that ...*i-na-a-a* in line 11 of the annals should not be restored to read *sa-me-ri-na-a-a* but to read the name of some other town (*Ondergang van Samaria*, 44-47). Other possibilities, however, do not appear to be very likely candidates.

⁽³⁰⁾ See TADMOR, "Campaigns of Sargon II", 22-32.

⁽³¹⁾ A portion of the text with translation is provided by W. G. LAMBERT, *Ladders to Heaven: Art Treasures from Lands of the Bible* (ed. O. W. MUSCARELLA) (Toronto 1981) 125.

⁽³²⁾ See H. W. F. SAGGS, "Historical Texts and Fragments of Sargon II of Assyria, 1. The 'Aššur Charter'", *Iraq* 37 (1975) 11-20. Sargon's reversal of policy toward Aššur could suggest that Shalmaneser was already experiencing domestic trouble with his own people, a factor which could explain his failure to accompany his troops on campaign in 722-721.

⁽³³⁾ GRAYSON, *Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles*, 73.

probably did not get to the west before late in that year. The western ringleaders were apparently Hamath under the rule of the usurper Yaubi'di and Gaza ruled by Hannun and aided by an Egyptian force. Others joining in the rebellion were Arpad, Šimirra, Damascus, Samaria, and probably Hadrach⁽³⁴⁾. In several inscriptions, Sargon refers to the capture of Samaria as well as the land of Beth Omri⁽³⁵⁾. The most interesting and important of the texts dealing with the capture of Samaria is the Calah or Nimrud Prism first published in 1954⁽³⁶⁾. Lines 25-49 in column 4 of fragment D are demarcated as a separate unit by horizontal lines as is typical of the text. This section opens with a description of the capture of Samaria but unfortunately several signs are missing from the opening of each line. The following is preserved of the first four lines:

- 25 []-me-ri-na-a-a ša it-ti šarri
 26 []-ia a-na la e-peš ar-du-ti
 27 []-še-e bil-ti
 28 []ig-me-lu-ma e-pu-šu ta-ḥa-zu.

There is widespread agreement on the restoration of lines 25 and 27 to restore LÚ.URU *sa-* or LÚ. *sa-* in line 25 (to read “the Samaritans”) and *u la na-* at the beginning of line 27 (to read “not to deliver tribute”). The restoration of lines 26 and 28 is disputed with proposed restorations being dependent on one’s understanding of the military and political conditions reflected in the text. Gadd suggested restoring *na-ki-ri* in line 26 and was followed by Tadmor (LÚ.KÚR = LÚ *nakru*). Borger proposed reading IGI.DU-*ia* = *ālik pāni-ia*. Gadd declined offering a proposed reading at the

(³⁴) Hadrach (Hatarikka) is indicated by the Asharna stela; see F. THUREAU-DANGIN, “La stèle d’Asharné”, *RA* 30 (1933) 53-56.

(³⁵) In four texts, Sargon refers to capturing the land of *bit ḥumri* (Pavement Inscription IV:31-32, Display Inscription Salon XIV:15, Cylinder Inscription 19-20, and Bull Inscription 21).

(³⁶) C. J. GADD, “Inscribed Prisms of Sargon II from Nimrud”, *Iraq* 16 (1954) 173-201. For translations of the text, see GADD, 180; TADMOR, “Campaigns of Sargon”, 34; R. BORGER, *Textbuch zur Geschichte Israels* (ed. K. GALLING) (Tübingen 1968) 60 and *Texte aus der Umwelt des Alten Testaments* (ed. O. KAISER) (Gütersloh 1984) 1/4.382; and H. SPIECKERMANN, *Juda unter Assur in der Sargonidenzeit* (FRLANT 129; Göttingen 1982) 348-350.

beginning of line 28. Tadmor suggested reading *a-ḥa-meš*. The recent proposals of Dalley (to restore *ibbalkitū/ikpudū*)⁽³⁷⁾ and of Na'aman (to restore *ŠĀ-šu-nu* or *lemutti*)⁽³⁸⁾ ignore the presence of a horizontal wedge following the break. This portion of the preceding sign makes their restorations impossible but provides the basis for Tadmor's restoration. The first full word in line 28 may be read as *ig-me-lu-ma* (from *gamālu* "to spare, be obliging, reach an agreement") or as *ik-me-lu-ma* (from *kamālu* "to become angry, wrathful").

Two main proposals have been made regarding the identity of the king mentioned in the text. One approach considers the king to be a non-Israelite anti-Assyrian monarch. The candidate most frequently suggested is Yaubi'di of Hamath⁽³⁹⁾ although the possibility has been proposed that the foreign ruler was an Egyptian, perhaps the notorious "King So" mentioned in 2 Kgs 17,4⁽⁴⁰⁾. The second alternative is to understand Sargon to be referring to his predecessor Shalmaneser V⁽⁴¹⁾. The first interpretation restores the beginning of line 26 to read *šarri [na-kiri]-ia* or [LÚ.KÚR]-*ia* "a king [hostile to] me". The second interpretation is based on the restoration *šarri* [IGI.DU = *ālik pāni*]-*ia* "the king [my predecessor]".

It seems highly unlikely that the king referred to in the text was an Egyptian. The leader of the Egyptian force defeated by Sargon near Raphia is called *re'e* the *turtan* of Egypt and no reference is made to an Egyptian king in any of the Assyrian descriptions of the events of 720-719.

The association of the king with Yaubi'di of Hamath is based on the prominence given him in other texts concerned with the western uprising. A usurper, he is mentioned in a dozen of Sargon's texts and blamed with enticing Arpad, Šimarra, Damascus, and Samaria to revolt (see the so-called Display Inscription). Dalley has argued against identifying the king with Yaubi'di based on the

⁽³⁷⁾ DALLEY, "Foreign Chariotry", 36, note 30.

⁽³⁸⁾ NA'AMAN, "Historical Background", 209-210.

⁽³⁹⁾ GADD, "Inscribed Prisms", 181-182; TADMOR, "Campaigns of Sargon", 37.

⁽⁴⁰⁾ D. B. REDFORD, "Sais and the Kushite Invasion of the Eighth Century B. C.", *JARCE* 22 (1985) 5-15. "There can be little doubt that in the 'hostile king' we must see Tefnakhte" (15).

⁽⁴¹⁾ So Borger, Spieckermann (see note 36), Dalley ("Foreign Chariotry", 36), and Na'aman ("Historical Background", 209-210).

conclusion that "Sargon is elsewhere so derogatory about him that it is out of the question that he would ever allow him such a prestigious title as LUGAL 'king'". Such an argument, however, is based on presuppositions about the character of a situation rather than on the text. At any rate, Dalley's argument is negated since, in his Cyprus Stela, Sargon does refer to Yaubi'di as "king"⁽⁴²⁾. Nonetheless, there are reasons for not assuming that Sargon is here referring to the king of Hamath. First, the struggle with Hamath does not fall within the purview of this particular text. Thus such an elliptical allusion to Yaubi'di would have made no sense in this context. Second, elsewhere when Sargon wishes to cast disparagement on Yaubi'di, he does so in clear and very uncomplimentary terms, not in such an indirect fashion as here.

The proposal to understand "the king" referred to as a reference to Shalmaneser V was first made by Borger and has been defended by Dalley and Na'aman. Dalley accepts the restoration on the assumption that reading "hostile" is out of the question since the text cannot refer to Yaubi'di. Na'aman's acceptance of this proposal is based on his larger argument that Shalmaneser took Samaria in his accession year (727-726) but that only Sargon took the city subsequently. According to him, Sargon "suppressed a rebellion that had already broken out in the time of Shalmaneser"⁽⁴³⁾. Two basic factors argue against understanding the text as Sargon's reference to hostilities and rebellion begun under Shalmaneser. First, in his fullest descriptions of the general western rebellion, Sargon always associates this with the usurpation of the throne of Hamath by Yaubi'di and his influence on the co-conspirators. None of the texts which offer an explanation of the revolt associate it in any way with Shalmaneser. Second, in his texts, Sargon glorifies his own deeds and stresses his own initiation of actions. One of these actions was the capture of Samaria which, in his annals, is given special prominence and placed in his accession year. It is thus highly unlikely that he would have described his own activity as bringing to conclusion something begun under his predecessor.

⁽⁴²⁾ DALLEY, "Foreign Chariotry", 36. In addition to the Cyprus Stela, a text published by Thompson refers to Yaubi'di as LUGAL: R.C. THOMPSON, "A Selection from the Cuneiform Historical Texts from Nineveh (1927-32)", *Iraq* 7 (1940) 85-111; the text is 122614 line 18.

⁽⁴³⁾ NA'AMAN, "Historical Background", 210.

Instead of some non-Israelite monarch, “a king” in line 25 of the Nimrud Prism could simply refer to a native Israelite king. This would appear to be the plain sense of the text particularly if one follows a restoration that reads “a king [hostile] to me”. Only Tadmor has seriously raised the question of whether Israel was ruled at the time by a native king. In discussing how Samaria may have been governed after the arrest of Hoshea and during its prolonged warfare with Assyria, Tadmor raised two possibilities: “(a) that there was no king in Samaria... and that the besieged city was governed by the generals of the army or by the city elders; (b) that a king whose name was recorded neither in the Bible nor in the Assyrian Inscriptions reigned until 722 or 720”. As argument against the latter proposal, he offered the following: “the probable reference to the ‘Samaritans’ rather than to the ‘[King of the] Samaritans’ in the Nimrud Prism — while Hannun of Gaza and Yaubi’di of Hamath are usually mentioned by name — seems to favour the first assumption”⁽⁴⁴⁾. However, if Samaria had already been declared an Assyrian province by Shalmaneser in 725, a reference to “the Samaritans” is exactly what one would expect. The references to Hannun king of Gaza and Yaubi’di the usurper of the throne of Hamath is also what one would expect since both of these states still held the status of vassal kingdoms rather than that of provinces. The other regions — Arpad, Šimarra, and Damascus — mentioned as participants in the revolt spearheaded by Yaubi’di have nothing said about their leadership. They too, like Samaria, had been provincialized. These cities thus belonged to a totally different political category than did Hamath and Gaza. For Sargon to have referred to “King X of Samaria” (or Arpad, Šimarra, or Damascus) would have implied political conditions contrary to reality as viewed by the Assyrians since Arpad, Šimarra, Damascus, and Samaria were provinces not states.

On the basis of the preceding discussion, the following restoration and translation of the opening lines of the Nimrud Prism may be proposed:

- 25 [LÚ.sa]-me-ri-na-a-a ša it-ti LUGAL
- 26 [LÚ.KÚR]-ia a-na la e-peš ar-du-ti
- 27 [ù la-na]-še-e bil-ti
- 28 [a-ḥa-me]š ig-me-lu-ma e-pu-šù ta-ḥa-zu

(44) TADMOR, “Campaigns of Sargon II”, 37.

The Samaritans, who with a king hostile to me, not to offer servitude and not to deliver tribute, came to an agreement and they offered battle.

The Samaritans, the inhabitants of the province of Samaria proclaimed by Shalmaneser in 725, covenanted together under a king to join in rebellion against Sargon who had assumed the throne in Tebet 722-721. The domestic strife within Assyria, the rebellion of Babylon under Marduk-apla-iddina, and the defeat of Sargon at Der by the Elamites may have contributed to Samaria's hopes of continuing to forestall the full consequences of provincialization. The outbreak of a rebellion under conditions very comparable to those following the death of Shalmaneser is reflected in Hos 10,1-8:

1. A luxuriant vine was Israel, his fruit was like him; when his fruit increased, so he increased altars;
according to the bounty of his land, so he made bountiful cultic pillars.
2. Their heart became deceitful; now they will bear their guilt.
He will break their altars; he will destroy their cult pillars.
3. Surely they will now say, "There is no king over us.
Surely, do we not fear Yahweh? And what can this king do to us?"
4. They have exchanged words, vain oaths, making a covenant;
and judgment spreads like poison weeds along the furrows of a field.
5. Over the calf of the house of iniquity they have been agitated,
the one set up in Samaria.
Surely its people mourned over it, and its priests concerning it.
They wailed over its glory, because it has departed from them;
6. for it has been carried to Assyria as tribute to the great king.
Within the year, Ephraim will be taken,
and Israel will be dismayed over his plan;
7. silenced will be the king of Samaria,
like a chip on the surface of the water;
8. and the high places of iniquity will be destroyed, the sin of Israel;
thorns and thistles shall grow up upon their altars;
and they will say to the mountains, "Cover us!" and to the hills, "Fall upon us!"

Several factors are presupposed in the rhetorical circumstances addressed by this text. (1) Widespread Israelite rebellion has broken out and the rebels have united under oath in a covenant pact (vv. 2.4.6b). (2) Monarchical authority over the people in the form of a particular king, probably Sargon during his accession year, has weakened and the people see this as a time for action in the name of Yahweh (v. 3). (3) The calf of Samaria has been taken into exile to the Assyrian ruler (vv. 5-6a). The reference is probably to the fact that when Samaria earlier surrendered to or was captured by the Assyrian army (between 15 Marheshvan and 12 Tebet 722) the sanctuary in the city or in the vicinity of Samaria was looted and the recently fashioned golden calf was carried as booty to Shalmaneser. (4) A king is ruling in Samaria, and Ephraim as a whole seems to be in rebellion (vv. 6b.7). In light of these circumstances, the prophet proclaims future disaster which he envisions coming within the year (vv. 6a-8). The parallels between the historical circumstances presupposed by this text and those of the early days of Sargon are striking. The involvement in the rebellion of Ephraim/Israel and not just the city of Samaria (v. 6b) explains why Sargon in four texts refers to his capture of not only the city of Samaria but also of the land of Omri.

If Sargon in 720-719 was opposed by the Samaritans led by a native king, two questions arise in light of the preceding discussion. First, was the Israelite king at the time of Sargon the same person elevated to kingship after the arrest of Hoshea (Hos 8,4)? Second, if one or two kings reigned over Samaria/Ephraim after the arrest of Hoshea, why do 2 Kgs 17,3-6 and 18,9-11 make no reference to this fact? To these questions, no satisfactory answers can be given.

Hos 13,1-14,1 which probably derives from very close to the time of Sargon's assault on Samaria (see 14,1) contains references to the people's request for a king (v. 10) as well as Yahweh's declaration that a king had both been given and taken away in divine wrath (v. 11). This, however, is most likely a reference to King Hoshea, placed over the people as a consequence of Pekah's rebellion against Assyria and then himself taken away because of rebellion against Assyria. The anger of Yahweh in both cases was the consequence of the breaking of a treaty sworn in the name of Yahweh. Whether Hoshea's replacement avoided capture in 722-721 and continued to rule until Sargon took the city some two years later or was deposed by Shalmaneser's forces and

subsequently replaced by a second “anonymous” ruler cannot be determined⁽⁴⁵⁾.

The lack of any reference in 2 Kings to any Israelite king following Hoshea may be due to either of two reasons. First, those who produced the sources used by the editors of the Kings material may have possessed no knowledge of the internal affairs prevailing in Israel because of the unsettled conditions of the time and Judah’s isolation from the events. That is, the Judean court may not have known the name of such a monarch. Although this would appear to be a highly unlikely situation, it must be noted that the Kings material does not report the conquest of Samaria by Sargon either. Second, the failure to record this information may have been based on ideological reasons, namely, the Judeans considered Hoshea to have been the last legitimate king in the north. Hoshea was placed in power by Tiglath-pileser and would have begun his rule with proper credentials according to a pro-Assyrian Judean court. Hoshea was probably still alive, though perhaps in exile, when the last reported event regarding the northern kingdom occurred, namely the capture of the region in 722-721. The southerners may have chosen not to dignify the claims of a rival claimant to the throne and condemned him by non-mention. That the Judean court was favorably disposed to Hoshea is indicated by the assessment of his reign: “He did the evil in the eyes of Yahweh though not like the kings of Israel who preceded him” (2 Kgs 17,2)⁽⁴⁶⁾. This positive attitude toward

⁽⁴⁵⁾ How destructive the Assyrian capture was in 722-721 cannot be determined. The archaeological remains from the site do not clearly indicate a massive destruction. On the archaeological data, see BECKING, *Ondergang van Samaria*, 64-68 and NA’AMAN, “Historical Background”, 209.

⁽⁴⁶⁾ This “positive” assessment of Hoshea suggests that at least some of the editorial evaluative judgments made about the monarchs in the Books of Kings may not derive from a late deuteronomistic editor. No one in late pre-exilic or exilic times would have had knowledge of events in Hoshea’s day that would have suggested this “positive” assessment unless it was preserved in written sources.

Rabbinic interpreters noted the positive evaluation of Hoshea and attributed it to Hoshea’s willingness to allow northerners to worship in Jerusalem (see b. BB 121a, b. Git 88a, and b. Taan 30b). A. VAN DER KOOIJ, “Zur Exegese von II Reg. 17, 2”, *ZAW* 96 (1984) 109-112, sees the positive assessment to be the result of the Assyrian capture of Dan which removed one of the northern golden calves. Hoshea ruled over a kingdom with only one calf!

Hoshea was probably based on Israel and Judah's shared pro-Assyrian policy at the time of Hoshea's rise to power and on the fact that Ahaz and Hoshea shared in the overthrow of Pekah (Hos 2,2)⁽⁴⁷⁾.

Other issues regarding Sargon's relationship to Samaria are less controversial than the question of Samaria's leadership at the time. Sargon makes no reference to any prolonged siege of Samaria nor does he describe the nature of its capture; thus how much destruction of the city occurred cannot be determined. Only chariots and the gods in which they trust (= their cultic paraphernalia) are listed as spoil taken by the Assyrians. If Sargon's western campaign saw him first defeating Yaubi'di at Qarqar and then moving down the coast where he subdued Hannun of Gaza, defeated the Egyptian army, and destroyed Raphia taking 9,033 inhabitants as spoil before returning to deal with the Samaritans, as seems most likely, the latter may have offered little resistance. This might explain the moderate punishment imposed on Samaria. Sargon appointed one of his officers as the governor. Some chariot crews (50 or 200; cf. Large Display Inscription: 24 with Nimrud prism, Fragment D, col. IV: 33) were incorporated into the royal forces. No special penalties were imposed on the people and no reference is made to any special booty taken. Sargon claims to have set the tribute at the rate of the former king (Large Display Inscription: 24) (Hoshea? Shalmaneser?) or to have required of the Samaritans the same duties and tax as of Assyrians (Khorsabad Annals: 17). Apparently the city of Samaria did not require rebuilding, as Dalley has recently argued. Instead of the widely accepted reading *Sa-me-ri-na ù-tir-ma eli šá pa-ni ù-še-me* ("Samaria I resettled and made it greater than before"), in lines 37-38 of the Nimrud Prism, she proposed reading the verb *atāru* rather than *tāru* and *ù-še-šib* instead of *ù-še-me* and understanding the verbs as a hendiadys: "I repopulated Samaria more than before"⁽⁴⁸⁾. Sargon further claims to have deported over 27,000 people from the area and to have imported to the region foreigners whom he had captured. The settlement of foreigners in the north,

(47) Scribes at the pro-Sargonid Jerusalem court may have deliberately omitted reference to Sargon's destruction of Samaria for political reasons.

(48) DALLEY, "Foreign Chariotry", 36. If the city was not heavily damaged rebuilding would not have been necessary.

noted in 2 Kgs 17,24, probably occurred in several waves and extended over several years⁽⁴⁹⁾.

IV. Conclusions

In light of the previous discussion the following conclusions may be drawn about the final days of Samaria.

(1) Hoshea began the organization of an anti-Pekah movement probably during Tiglath-pileser's second campaign against Damascus in 732-731 (2 Kgs 15,30aa) and was designated the new king over Israel (or *bit Humria*) by Tiglath-pileser (III R 10, 2:17-18; ND4301 + 4305: rev. 10-11) before he left the region in 731 or during the twelfth year of Ahaz (Tishri 732-Tishri 731) (2 Kgs 17,1).

(2) Hoshea, aided by the pro-Assyrian Ahaz (Hos 2,2), had to overcome the unrepentant Pekah and his forces who remained in control of Samaria (Layard 66:228) and the Ephraimite hill country at the time of Tiglath-pileser's withdrawal. Samaria was not taken (2 Kgs 17,30aß) until after Marheshvan 731. In his accession year (ending Marheshvan 730), Hoshea sent tribute to Tiglath-pileser encamped at Sarribanu (ND4301 + 4305: rev. 10-11) in southern Babylonia.

(3) Hoshea paid annual tribute to Assyria during his first two regnal years (Marheshvan 730-Marheshvan 728) but joined the western revolt participated in by Damascus and Tyre which broke out in Tiglath-pileser's seventeenth year (Nisan 728-Nisan 727).

(4) Shalmaneser, in his accession year (25 Tebet-Nisan 726), completed a western campaign begun by Tiglath-pileser (Eponym Chronicle). When he campaigned against Hoshea, the latter submitted and paid tribute (2 Kgs 17,3).

(5) When Shalmaneser remained in Assyria during his first regnal year (Nisan 726-Nisan 725) (Eponym Chronicle), revolt erupted again in the west and Hoshea joined the movement sending representatives to Egypt to negotiate for assistance (2 Kgs 17,4a).

⁽⁴⁹⁾ TADMOR, "Some Aspects of the History of Samaria during the Biblical Period", *Jerusalem Cathedra* 3 (1983) 1-11; COGAN-TADMOR, *II Kings*, 209; NA'AMAN and R. ZADOK, "Sargon II's Deportations to Israel and Philistia (716-708 BC)", *JCS* 40 (1988) 36-46.

(6) Shalmaneser marched to the west probably early in his second regnal year (Nisan 725-Nisan 724) attacked Hoshea for the second time, demolished parts of Samaria, looted the royal temple in Bethel, arrested Hoshea, and decreed provincial status for Samaria (2 Kgs 17,4b; Hos 10,14-15; Isa 32,14; Babylonian Chronicle 1.i.28). After subduing Samaria, Shalmaneser moved against Tyre, placing it under siege before the autumn new year festival in 725 (Hos 9,13; *Ant.* 9.285-286).

(7) In response to the decree of Shalmaneser, Samaria and Ephraim rose up in rebellion, placed a new king on the throne, and established a state sanctuary within the city or in the environs of Samaria (Hos 8,4-5a). In his third regnal year (Nisan 724-Nisan 723), Shalmaneser campaigned in the west again. He had to attack the whole of Ephraim (2 Kgs 17,5a) eventually placing Samaria under siege after Marheshvan 724 in the seventh year of Hoshea (Marheshvan 724-Marheshvan 723) and the fourth year of Hezekiah (Tishri 724-Tishri 723) (2 Kgs 18,9). The deportation of Israelites (2 Kgs 17,6aß) began in Shalmaneser's third year during the course of this campaign.

(8) Samaria was captured by or surrendered to the Assyrians for the third time in Shalmaneser's fifth year (Nisan 722-Nisan 721) during which the king was not on campaign (Eponym Chronicle). The city fell to the Assyrian army at some time between 15 Marheshvan and the death of Shalmaneser in Tebet 722, in Hezekiah's sixth year (Tishri 722-Tishri 721) and Hoshea's ninth year (Marheshvan 722-Marheshvan 721) (2 Kgs 17,6aα; 18,9).

(9) With Sargon's accession marked by domestic strife (Borowski Stela) and by troubles with Elam and Babylon (Babylonian Chronicle 1.i.33-35; Aššur Charter: 16-18), the Assyrian army withdrew from the west, lifting the siege of Tyre and leaving matters unsettled in Samaria. Rebellion again broke out, involving the province of Samaria and its capital (Nimrud Prism, Fragment D, col. IV:25-28), co-ordinated with revolt by the states of Hamath and Gaza and the provinces of Arpad, Šimirra, Damascus, and Hadrach (Khorsabad Annals; Asharna Stela). The rebellion probably coincided with the death of Shalmaneser or the early days of Sargon's troubles.

(10) Late in his second regnal year (Nisan 720-Nisan 719), Sargon campaigned in the west defeating Yaubi'di of Hamath,

Hannun of Gaza, and the *turtan* of Egypt before quickly suppressing the revolt in the province of Samaria. Sargon presided over the fourth submission of Samaria, finally implemented the full provincialization of the region, deporting Samaritans, carrying off their cultic paraphernalia, placing one of his officers as governor over the region, repopulating the city and importing foreigners into the region.

102 Bishops Hall
Emory University
Atlanta, GA 30322 USA

John H. HAYES – Jeffrey K. KUAN

SOMMAIRE

La fin du royaume de Samarie reste un sujet débattu par les spécialistes. Tout récemment, N. Na'aman a remis en question l'opinion dominante des deux conquêtes assyriennes proposée par H. Tadmor. Il suggère au contraire qu'il n'y a eu qu'une seule conquête. Dans cet article, nous soutenons que Samarie s'est rendue aux Assyriens ou fut conquise par eux à quatre reprises autour de 720: d'abord en 727-726 quand Osée se soumit à Salmanasar V qui terminait une campagne commencée par son prédécesseur; en second lieu, en 725-724, quand Salmanasar V attaqua Samarie, arrêta Osée et décréta que Samarie deviendrait une province de l'empire; en troisième lieu, 722-721, quand Samarie fut conquise après un siège de trois ans à la suite d'une autre révolte et de l'intronisation d'un nouveau roi par les habitants de Samarie; en quatrième lieu, en 720-719, quand Sargon II reprit la ville et fit définitivement de cette région une province de son empire.

The Story of Jesus and the Adulteress (John 7,53-8,11) Reconsidered

The current consensus that the story of Jesus and the adulteress in John 7,53-8,11 was originally not part of the gospel of John is based on both external and internal evidence. According to the consensus opinion the external textual evidence appears to be overwhelming, since the pericope is absent from many of the early and best manuscript traditions. On internal grounds it is often maintained that the pericope not only exhibits non-Johannine style and vocabulary but also interrupts an otherwise smooth narrative flow from 7,52 to 8,12⁽¹⁾.

Without entering into the external evidence we wish to call into question the internal evidence for the non-Johannine character of the story. We propose, first, that there are striking linguistic links between the story and the Johannine narrative that previous scholars have neglected or undervalued⁽²⁾. Second, we will

⁽¹⁾ For various discussions of the pericope, including both the external and internal evidence, see P. SACCHI, "La pericope dell'adultera", *Alle origini del Nuovo Testamento* (Firenze 1956) 43-51; U. BECKER, *Jesus und die Ehebrecherin: Untersuchungen zur Text- und Überlieferungsgeschichte von Joh. 7 53-8 11* (BZNW 28; Berlin 1963); B.M. METZGER, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (New York 1971) 219-222; H. V. VON CAMPENHAUSEN, "Zur Perikope von der Ehebrecherin (Joh 7:53-8:11)", *ZNW* 68 (1977) 164-175; F. ROUSSEAU, "La femme adultère: Structure de Jn 7,53-8,11", *Bib* 59 (1978) 463-480; Z.C. HODGES, "Problem Passages in the Gospel of John. Part 8: The Woman Taken in Adultery (John 7:53-8:11): The Text", *BSac* 136 (1979) 318-332; G. M. BURGE, "A Specific Problem in the New Testament Text and Canon: The Woman Caught in Adultery (John 7:53-8:11)", *JETS* 27 (1984) 141-148; B.D. EHRMAN, "Jesus and the Adulteress", *NTS* 34 (1988) 24-44; P. COMFORT, "The Pericope of the Adulteress", *BT* 40 (1989) 145-147.

⁽²⁾ For a recent treatment which undervalues the Johannine character of the story in favor of its Lucan character because of its style and theology, see M. GOURGUES, "'Moi non plus je ne te condamne pas': Les mots et la théologie de Luc en Jean 8,1-11 (la femme adultère)", *ScRel* 19 (1990) 305-318.

demonstrate through a close reading a remarkable literary linkage indicating that the story contributes to, rather than detracts from, the narrative progression in John 7-8⁽³⁾.

I. Linguistic Linkage

To argue, as is commonly done, that our story is non-Johannine because it contains words or stylistic features not found elsewhere in John is extremely precarious for such a brief passage of only twelve verses⁽⁴⁾. The use of unusual vocabulary may simply be due to the uniqueness of the story. There are other short Johannine passages, such as the healing of the man at the pool in Jerusalem (5,1-11) and the miraculous feeding (6,1-15), which also contain a number of words not found elsewhere in the gospel, yet their Johannine character is unquestioned⁽⁵⁾. But beyond that we would like to draw attention to the following significant linguistic links of style and vocabulary between our story and the rest of the gospel⁽⁶⁾.

1. *Teaching in the Temple in 8,2 and 7,14*

After spending the night on the Mount of Olives (8,1), Jesus returned on the next day "to the temple" (*eis to hieron*) and sat down and "taught" (*edidasken*) all the people who came to him in

⁽³⁾ In our attempt to argue for the Johannine character of the story we will present evidence not considered in some previous attempts, e.g. Z. C. HODGES, "Problem Passages in the Gospel of John. Part 9: The Woman Taken in Adultery (John 7:53-8:11): Exposition", *BSac* 137 (1980) 41-53; C. P. BAYLIS, "The Woman Caught in Adultery: A Test of Jesus as the Greater Prophet", *BSac* 146 (1989) 171-184.

⁽⁴⁾ BECKER, *Ehebrecherin*, 43-74; METZGER, *Textual Commentary*, 220.

⁽⁵⁾ The unique Johannine words in John 5,1-11 include in v.2: *probatikē* (sheep gate), *epilegomenē* (called), *Bēthzatha*; v.3: *chōlōn* (lame), *xērōn* (crippled); vv.8-11: *krabaton* (mat); and in John 6,1-15: v.7: *brachu* (little); v.9: *paidarion* (boy), *krithinous* (barley, also v.13); v.10: *chortos* (grass), *arithmon* (number), *pentakischilioi* (five thousand); vv.12-13: *perisseusanta* (left over), *klasmata* (fragments); v.13: *kophinous* (baskets), *bebrōkosin* (eaten); v.15: *anechōresen* (withdrew).

⁽⁶⁾ In what follows we will concentrate exclusively on the impressive positive linguistic and literary evidence for considering the story of the adulteress to be an authentic part of John's gospel. We feel that this is a new presentation of the evidence that needs to be considered and that it overrides the negative argumentation. For a detailed discussion of the negative evidence, see BECKER, *Ehebrecherin*, 43-91.

8,2. The same vocabulary was used previously in 7,14 when, with the feast of Tabernacles already half over, Jesus went up “to the temple” (*eis to hieron*) and “taught” (*edidasken*)⁽⁷⁾.

2. *The Narrator's Asides in John 8,6 and 6,6*

After the scribes and Pharisees have presented the woman they have caught in the act of adultery to Jesus (8,3-4) and asked what he has to say about the case in view of the fact that the Mosaic law commands such women to be stoned (8,5), the narrator interrupts the story with an aside to the reader in 8,6: “They said this to test him, so that they may be able to accuse him”. This parenthetical aside is remarkably similar in vocabulary, style and function to the one that occurs in the miraculous feeding story (6,1-15). After Jesus asks Philip where they can buy enough food for the crowd to eat (6,5), the narrator interrupts with an aside in 6,6: “He said this to test him, for he himself knew what he was going to do”. The introductions to these asides are nearly identical in vocabulary and style:

6,6 *touto de elegen peirazōn auton*

8,6 *touto de elegon peirazontes auton.*

The literary function of both asides is to inform the reader of the motivation of a previous questioner, creating the suspense of whether or how the motivation will succeed. The difference is that Jesus is the one who “tests” Philip in 6,6 whereas the scribes and Pharisees “test” Jesus in 8,6. Such asides are quite characteristic of the narrative style of the gospel of John⁽⁸⁾.

(7) BECKER, *Ehebrecherin*, 47-49, points out similarities between John 8,2 and various passages in the synoptic gospels, but fails to note the more direct connection with John 7,14.

(8) BECKER, *Ehebrecherin*, 57, dismisses the aside in 8,6 as an interpolation because it disrupts the flow of the narrative. But such interruptive asides occur frequently in the gospel and are an important indication of Johannine style. For a discussion and listings of the asides in John, see M.C. TENNEY, “The Footnotes of John’s Gospel”, *BSac* 117 (1960) 350-364; J.J. O’ROURKE, “Asides in the Gospel of John”, *NT* 21 (1979) 210-219; R. A. CULPEPPER, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Literary Design* (Philadelphia 1983) 16-18.

3. "To Throw a Stone" in John 8,7 and 8,59

After the scribes and Pharisees have tested Jesus as to whether or not the adulteress should be stoned, he utters the powerful words which will extricate both him and the woman from their trap in 8,7: "Let the one among you who is without sin be the first to throw a stone at her (*ep' autēn baletō lithon*)". At the conclusion of the chapter the same vocabulary is used for the attempt of the Jews to kill Jesus in 8,59: "Then they took up stones to throw at him (*lithous hina balōsin ep' auton*)" (9). The relation between these passages is not merely external or coincidental, but is an important part of the inner dynamics of the narrative. When the Jews finally take up stones to throw at Jesus, they attempt to do to Jesus what they did not dare to do to the adulteress because of their own sinfulness (8,7-9). They ironically reveal that their true intent with regard to stoning the woman was actually to kill Jesus, as he had accused them both before (7,19) and after the case of the adulteress (8,37.40).

4. "Sin No Longer" in John 8,11 and 5,14

After no one, including Jesus, has condemned the adulteress, Jesus dismisses her in 8,11: "Go, and from now on sin no longer (*mēketi hamartane*)". Jesus thus repeats to the woman the same command he had issued to the man he healed at the pool in 5,14: "Look, you have become well; sin no longer (*mēketi hamartane*), so that nothing worse may happen to you". This explicit linguistic link between our story and the gospel involves significant Johannine terminology. These commands to "sin no longer" are in Johannine terms virtual appeals to believe in the profound identity of Jesus in order to have eternal life, the main purpose of the gospel (20,31). This becomes especially evident in a negative way in 8,24 when Jesus tells the Jews, "you will die in your sins, for if you do not believe that I am, you will die in your sins" (10).

II. Literary Linkage

In addition to the above noteworthy linguistic links between our story and the gospel there are literary considerations which

(9) See also 10,31.

(10) See also 8

indicate that our story is indeed not disruptive but actually plays a significant role in the narrative flow of John 7–8.

1. *The Narrative Sequence*

Does the narrative of John 7–8 flow better with or without the story of Jesus and the adulteress? Without the story the transition between 7,52 and 8,12 appears rather awkward. Jesus is not present in the scene of 7,45–52, which concludes with a reply of the Pharisees to Nicodemus. In 8,12, however, Jesus is speaking “again” (*palin*) to an indefinite “them” (*autois*), saying, “I am the light of the world. Whoever follows me will not walk in darkness, but will have the light of life”. The Pharisees then reply in 8,13. Without our story the “them” to whom Jesus is again speaking in 8,12 would logically refer to those present the last time Jesus spoke, which was in the scene of 7,37–44. This is possible but more awkward than with our story, in which case the “them” of 8,12 could simply refer directly to the “them” (*autous*), that is “all the people”, whom Jesus is teaching in 8,2 and indirectly to the adulteress and the Pharisees, who presumably left in 8,9 but are present in 8,13⁽¹⁾.

Furthermore, with the story the transition from 7,52 to 7,53 and the introduction to the story appears quite smooth. When 7,53 states that “each went to his own house”, the reference for “each” would be the guards, the chief priests, the Pharisees and Nicodemus, thus bringing the preceding scene (7,45–52) to a conclusion. Then, in contrast to those who went to their homes, “Jesus went to the Mount of Olives” in 8,1, thus bringing to a conclusion the scene of his teaching on the great day of the feast of Tabernacles (7,37–44). A new scene then begins in 8,2 when Jesus returns to the temple on the next day and continues to teach (see 7,14).

2. *The Plot to Arrest and Kill Jesus*

Within the narrative progression of John 7–8 the story of Jesus and the adulteress plays a distinctive role in the plot to arrest and kill Jesus. The ominous tone of this plot is established at the outset

⁽¹⁾ COMFORT, “Adulteress”, 146, interprets 8,12 as Jesus’ indirect response to the Pharisees of 7,45–52, despite Jesus’ absence from that scene. This is possible but more awkward than interpreting 8,12 as an indirect response to the Pharisees Jesus would have just addressed in 8,7 if the story of the adulteress is included.

with the notice that Jesus did not wish to travel in Judea because the Jews “were seeking” (*ezētoun*) to kill him (7,1). When Jesus finally does go secretly to Judea (7,10), the threat intensifies as the Jews “were seeking” (*ezētoun*) him (7,11). During his teaching in the temple Jesus confronts the Jews with their death plot against him: “Why are you seeking to kill me?” (7,19). And later some of the inhabitants of Jerusalem ask whether Jesus is not the one “they are seeking to kill” (7,25).

In 7,30 the attempt to kill Jesus becomes the attempt to first arrest him: “They then sought to arrest him, but no one laid a hand upon him, because his hour had not yet come”. After many of the crowd began to believe in him (7,31), “the chief priests and the Pharisees sent guards to arrest him” (7,32). Eventually even some of the crowd “wanted to arrest him, but no one laid hands on him” (7,44). In 7,45-46 it becomes evident that the sending of the guards by the chief priests and the Pharisees has failed. At this point the story of Jesus and the adulteress, in which the scribes and the Pharisees “test” Jesus in order to “accuse” him (8,6), takes its place within the narrative progression as a renewed attempt to arrest and kill Jesus after previous failures.

Although this attempt likewise fails because the powerful words of Jesus free both himself and the woman from their trap (8,7-9), the plot to arrest and kill Jesus continues in the succeeding narrative. After Jesus taught in the temple treasury, “no one arrested him, because his hour had not yet come” (8,20). In 8,37 Jesus again confronts the Jews with their attempt to kill him: “But you are seeking to kill me, because my word has no room among you”. And in 8,40 Jesus repeats: “But now you are seeking to kill me, a man who has told you the truth which I heard from God”.

The Jews’ plot to arrest and kill Jesus in John 7-8 comes to a climax after Jesus announces that “before Abraham came to be, I am” (8,58). The Jews then “took up stones to throw at him, but Jesus hid and went out of the temple” (8,59). A further connection between the story of the adulteress and the narrative progression involving the plot to kill Jesus now becomes evident. As we have already noted, when the Jews “took up stones to throw at him” they tried to do to Jesus what he had prevented them from doing to the adulteress (8,7-9). It becomes obvious that they were more interested in stoning and killing Jesus than the woman. Rather than succeeding in their “test” to “accuse” Jesus (8,6), they ironically

indict themselves of the murderous accusations Jesus brought against them (7,19; 8,37.40). Without the story of the adulteress the overall narrative of John 7–8, especially the irony involved in the attempt to kill Jesus, is the poorer⁽¹²⁾.

3. *The Test of Jesus' Teaching as a Prophet*

Another issue running through John 7–8 is that of Jesus as a prophetic teacher and the relation of his teaching to the law of Moses. After Jesus began teaching in the temple (7,14), the Jews question how it is possible for him to “know scripture without having studied” (7,15). Jesus explains that his “teaching” comes not from himself but directly from God who sent him (7,16) and can be recognized as coming from God by those who do God’s will (7,17). He goes on to accuse them of not keeping the law Moses gave them, because they seek to kill him (7,19) for healing a man on the sabbath (see John 5). He then demonstrates his superior knowledge of Mosaic law by explaining that since it permits a man to be circumcised on the sabbath, he surely has not broken the law by healing a whole person on the sabbath (7,21-23).

Jesus continues his teaching in the temple (7,28), and after his impressive exclamation on the last great day of the feast of Tabernacles (7,37-39), some of the crowd who heard these words of his teaching proclaim, “This is truly the prophet!” (7,40). They thus suggest that Jesus is the prophet-like-Moses whom Moses promised that God would raise up to be an authentic prophetic teacher of God’s words (Deut 18,15-18). Even the guards sent by the chief priests and the Pharisees to arrest Jesus (7,32.45) are impressed by his prophetic teaching: “Never before has a man spoken like this!” (7,46). After the Pharisees point out that none of the authorities or the Pharisees have believed in Jesus, but only the accursed crowd ignorant of the law (7,47-49), Nicodemus, one of the Pharisees who had been earlier impressed with Jesus as a teacher (3,1-15), defends him with reference to the law (7,50): “Does our law judge a person without first hearing from him and knowing what he does?” (7,51). In reply the Pharisees contradict the prophetic character of Jesus’

⁽¹²⁾ On Johannine irony, see P. D. DUKE, *Irony in the Fourth Gospel* (Atlanta 1985); G. R. O’DAY, *Revelation in the Fourth Gospel: Narrative Mode and Theological Claim* (Philadelphia 1986).

teaching because of his Galilean origin: "Search (the scriptures) and see that no prophet arises from Galilee" (7,52).

At this point the story of Jesus and the adulteress takes its place within the narrative flow as the hearing before the law requested by Nicodemus, which serves to vindicate Jesus as a prophetic teacher. As Jesus continues his teaching in the temple (8,2), it is quite appropriate that now the scribes rather than the chief priests join the Pharisees in trying to trap Jesus, since the Jews had earlier questioned Jesus' knowledge of "scripture" (*grammata*, 7,15) and the "scribes" (*grammateis*) are scriptural experts. Presenting the adulteress (8,3) and purposefully addressing Jesus as "teacher" (8,4; see 7,14.16.17.28), the scribes and the Pharisees test the teaching of Jesus with explicit reference to the law of Moses: "In the law Moses commanded us to stone such women. So what do you say?" (8,5). Jesus overcomes the test with a powerful prophetic teaching: "Let the one among you who is without sin be the first to throw a stone at her" (8,7). After the Jewish leaders have departed (8,9) and Jesus has dismissed the adulteress with a command to sin no longer (8,10-11), the reader realizes that the crowd was correct (7,40) and the Pharisees wrong (7,52) about Jesus being a prophetic teacher in relation to Mosaic law⁽¹³⁾.

As the narrative progresses through John 8 Jesus continues his prophetic teaching (8,20) with reference to "your law" (8,17). Through the disbelieving questions of the Jews in 8,53 the reader experiences the irony that Jesus is indeed "greater than Abraham" and the "prophets" who died⁽¹⁴⁾.

4. *The Appeal from Sin to Faith*

Another prominent theme in John 7-8 is the appeal to believe in Jesus. After many of the crowd "believed" in him (7,31), the chief priests and the Pharisees sent guards to arrest him (7,32). But on the last great day of the feast Jesus makes a dramatic plea for faith in him (7,37-39). Nevertheless, as the Pharisees point out, neither they nor the authorities have "believed" in him (7,48).

⁽¹³⁾ The Samaritan adulteress also experienced the knowledge and teaching of Jesus (4,16-26) and acknowledged him as a "prophet" (4,19).

⁽¹⁴⁾ For a different explanation of John 7,53-8,11 as the test of Jesus as a prophet, see BAYLIS, "Woman Caught in Adultery", 176-184.

The story of the adulteress contributes to the theme of Jesus' appeal for faith. At the end of the story Jesus appeals for the adulteress to "sin no longer" (8,11), which also functions as an indirect appeal to the Jewish leaders who have been forced by the powerful word of Jesus to realize they are as sinful as the woman (8,7). The sinful woman who remains before Jesus thus serves as a representative for her sinful Jewish leaders in much the same way as the adulterous situation of the Samaritan woman served to represent the idolatry and false belief of her people (4,16-30.39-42)⁽¹⁵⁾. As we mentioned above, the command to "sin no longer" (8,11; 5,14) is in Johannine terms a virtual appeal for faith, as is confirmed in 8,24 when Jesus urges the Pharisees to "believe" in him rather than die in their "sins" (see also 8,21).

The theme of the appeal from sin (8,7.11) to faith continues as Jesus warns those Jews who have "believed" him (8,30-31) that everyone who commits "sin" is a slave of "sin" (8,34). He points out that although he has spoken the truth, they do not really "believe" him (8,45). Then, as the story of the adulteress has made especially evident, Jesus asserts that no one can convict him of "sin" and appeals for them to "believe" him (8,46). But they remain in their sin of unbelief as they tragically try to stone Jesus (8,59).

5. *Judging and Condemning*

Finally, the story of the adulteress plays a role in the theme of judging and condemning in John 7-8. While teaching in the temple in 7,24 Jesus commands the Jews not to "judge" by appearances, but to "judge" with right "judgment". Later Nicodemus defends Jesus by asking the Pharisees if our law "judges" or "condemns" a person without first hearing from him (7,51). Then, in the story of the adulteress, after the Jewish leaders are unable to condemn with the help of the law either Jesus or the woman, Jesus says to her, "Neither do I condemn you" (8,11)⁽¹⁶⁾. Jesus' refusal to condemn

⁽¹⁵⁾ On John 4, see O'DAY, *Revelation*, 49-92; L. ESLINGER, "The Wooing of the Woman at the Well: Jesus, the Reader and Reader-Response Criticism", *Journal of Literature and Theology* 1 (1987) 167-183; H. BOERS, *Neither on this Mountain Nor in Jerusalem: A Study of John 4* (SBLMS 35; Atlanta 1988); T. OKURE, *The Johannine Approach to Mission: A Contextual Study of John 4:1-42* (WUNT 2/31; Tübingen 1988).

⁽¹⁶⁾ Perhaps the form *katakrinō* is used exclusively in John in the story

the adulteress confirms his later statement to the Pharisees in 8,15: "You judge according to the flesh, but I judge no one". After warning them they will die in their sins unless they believe in him (8,24), Jesus declares that he has many things to say and "judge" or "condemn" about them (8,26).

Conclusion

We have attempted to demonstrate that based on the internal evidence the story of Jesus and the adulteress in John 7,53–8,11 fits perfectly well within its narrative context in John's gospel. There are explicit linguistic links of vocabulary and style as well as thematic literary links between the story and the Johannine narrative. The story contributes to rather than detracts from the narrative flow in John 7–8.

It is our hope that this reconsideration of the internal evidence may lead to a reconsideration of the external textual evidence. Most of those who maintain the non-Johannine origin of the story acknowledge that it is a unique case in textual criticism and that the story appears to be an early and authentic part of the gospel traditions. Is it possible that an interpolator has shaped the story to fit the narrative flow of John 7–8 as well as we have argued that it does? Or is it more likely that it was part of the original gospel of John? Is it possible that the external evidence is not so overwhelming after all and that the story could have been omitted very early on in the manuscript traditions⁽¹⁷⁾?

Kenrick-Glennon Seminary
St. Louis, Missouri 63119-4399 USA

John Paul HEIL

SOMMAIRE

Entre l'histoire de Jésus et de la femme adultère (Jn 7,53–8,11) et le reste de l'évangile de Jean, il existe des liens explicites de vocabulaire et de style, ainsi que des liens thématiques. Il s'ensuit que ce récit contribue au développement de la narration de Jn 7–8 plus qu'il ne l'interrompt. Ce nouvel examen des preuves internes conduit à reconsidérer les preuves textuelles externes et plaide en faveur de l'inclusion de ce récit dans l'évangile original de Jean.

of the adulteress (8,10-11) because it appropriately expresses a stronger sense of condemnation than *krinō*, which is used elsewhere in John, but can mean both "judge" and "condemn". See BAGD, 412,451-452.

⁽¹⁷⁾ For more on this suggestion and a possible reconstruction of the external evidence, see HODGES, "The Text", 318-332.

Los orígenes de 1 Corintios

Estamos lejos de haber escuchado la «última palabra» en lo que respecta a la formación y estructura de la Primera carta a los Corintios. Las voces que se inclinaban a ver en ella un «mosaico de cartas» (muchas veces en conjunto con 2 Cor) cobraron cada vez mayor fuerza desde principios de siglo; pero ahora, esas voces parecen, en gran parte, silenciadas. Sin embargo, el problema sigue sin resolverse.

La estructura de la carta no surge evidente, pero las dificultades que ofrece no se resuelven por los recortes propuestos, sino por el contrario, aumentan⁽¹⁾. Por otra parte, la falta de coherencia (*Kohärenzanalyse*)⁽²⁾ parece evidente en más de una oportunidad, y sería, en este caso, signo de la no-unidad de la carta. Podemos decir, resumiendo, que no faltan razones a quienes se inclinan por una u otra postura. Recientemente, además, se ha insistido en la posibilidad de interpolaciones⁽³⁾, lo cual es, de algún modo, una variante intermedia, ya que no ve unidad en la carta, pero asimismo rechaza que haya más de una carta en el interior de 1 Cor⁽⁴⁾.

(1) Así opina G. FRIEDRICH, «Christus, Einheit und Norm der Christen. Das Grundmotiv des ersten Korintherbriefes», *KD* 9 (1963) 236.

(2) Cf. H. MERKLEIN, «Die Einheitlichkeit des ersten Korintherbriefes», *ZNW* 75 (1984) 158.

(3) El tema ya está presentado por Kümmel en su clásica *Introducción* (sólo las posibles interpolaciones de 1,2b y 14,33b-35) pero concluye que son «very unlikely here as well» (W.G. KÜMMEL, *Introduction to the New Testament*. Revised and enlarged edition [traducción de la 17ª ed. alemana] [Nashville 1975] 275-276); cf. A. WIKENHAUSER-J. SCHMID, *Introducción al Nuevo Testamento* (nueva ed.; Barcelona 1978) 645-646.

(4) «In contrast to 2 Corinthians, which is certainly a compilation of Pauline letters, challenges to the literary unity of 1 Corinthians have rightly met with little success. However, anyone familiar with recent literature on 1 Corinthians will have noticed an increasing tendency to discern interpolations in this letter, some only a single verse, but others almost a complete chapter», J. MURPHY-O'CONNOR, «Interpolations in 1 Corinthians», *CBQ* 48 (1986) 81. Ver, asimismo: W. MUNRO, «Interpolation in the Epistles: Weighing Probabilities», *NTS* 36 (1990) 431-443.

Este es, hasta el presente, el «status quaestionis», veámoslo más detenidamente.

I. Status quaestionis

1. *¿Un mosaico de cartas?*

Ya en su comentario de 1910, J. Weiß propone la reconstrucción de dos cartas que se encontrarían en la actual 1 Cor:

carta A: 10,1-22(23); 6,12-20; 9,24-27; 11,2-34; 16,7b-9.15-20 (2 Cor 6,14-7,1).

carta B: 1,1-8,13; 7; 8; 13; 10,24-11,1; 9,1-23; 12; 14; 15; 16,1-7a.10-14.21-24⁽⁵⁾.

J. Héring propone también una división en dos cartas originales según los informantes:

carta A (Cloe): 1,1-8,13; 10,23-11,1; 16,1-4.10-14.

carta B (Estéfanos): 9,1-10,22; 11,2-15,58; 16,5-9.15-24⁽⁶⁾.

P. Cleary analiza las divisiones propuestas hasta entonces (1950) y propone una división (conjuntamente con 2 Cor) en cuatro cartas:

primera carta: I 10,1-12; 6,9-11; 10,13; 6,13b-20; II 6,14-7,1; I 10,14-22a; 6,12-13a; 8,8; 10,31-11,2; 4,17; 14,34-35; 11,3.8-12.17-34; 4,18-21; 15,1-19.29-34.20-28.35-58; 9,24-27; 16,15-24.

segunda carta: I 1,1-4,16; II 13,19b-21; I 6,1-8; 5,1-13; 7,1-8,7; 10,22b-30; 8,9-13; 12,1-14,33; 11,4-7.13-16; 14,36-40; 16,1-14.

tercera carta: II 10,1-12,19a; I 9,1-23; II 13,1-10.

cuarta carta: II 1,1-6,13; 7,2-9,15; 13,11-13⁽⁷⁾.

W. Schmithals, en su ya clásica *Gnosis in Korinth* divide en seis las dos cartas, pero sólo las dos primeras se encuentran en nuestra actual 1 Cor:

primera carta (*Vorbrief*): II 6,14-7,1; I 9,24-10,22; 6,12-20; 11,2-34; 15; 16,13-24.

⁽⁵⁾ J. WEISS, *Der erste Korintherbrief* (KEK 5; Göttingen 91910) XL.

⁽⁶⁾ J. HÉRING, *La première épître de saint Paul aux Corinthiens* (CNT VII; Neuchâtel-Paris 1949) 10-12.

⁽⁷⁾ P. CLEARY, «The Epistle to the Corinthians», *CBQ* 12 (1950) 10-33 (cf. 33).

segunda carta (*Antwortbrief*): I 1,1-6,11; 7,1-9,23; 10,23-11,1; 12,1-31a; 14,1c-40; 12,31b-13,13; 16,1-12⁽⁸⁾.

W. Schenk propone encontrar en nuestras actuales dos cartas, rastros de nueve, aunque las últimas cinco (E a I) se limitan a nuestra 2 Cor:

A (*Vorbrief*): I 1,1-9; II 6,14-7,1; I 6,1-11 ... 11,2-34; 15; 16,13-24.

B: I 9,1-18.24-27; 10,1-22; 6,12-20; 5,1-13.

C (*Antwortbrief*): I 7; 8; 9,19-23; 10,23-11,1; 12,1-31a; 14,1c-40; 12,31b-13,13; 16,1-16.

D: I 1,10-4,21⁽⁹⁾.

Como puede verse, las cartas A y C de Schenk guardan cierta semejanza con las cartas A y B de Schmithals, aunque las amplía; esto motivó a Schmithals a revisar su postura y proponer una nueva división:

A: I 11,2-34.

B (*Vorbrief*): I 6,1-11; II 6,14-7,1; I 6,12-20; 9,24-10,22; 15,1-58; 16,13-24.

C (*Antwortbrief*): I 5,1-13; 7,1-8,13; 9,19-22; 10,23-11,1; 12,1-31a; 14,1c-40; 12,31b-13,13; 16,1-12.

D: I 1,1-4,21.

E (*Zwischenbrief*): II 2,14-6,2.

F: I 9,1-18; II 6,3-13; 7,2-4.

G (*Tränenbrief*): II 10,1-13,13.

H (*Kollektenbrief*): II 9,1-15.

I (*Freudenbrief*): II 1,1-2,13; 7,5-8,24⁽¹⁰⁾.

También cercano a la posición de Schenk, Ch. Senft propone en su comentario descubrir cuatro cartas:

A: 6,1-11; 15,1-58; 16,13-24.

B: 5,1-13; 9,24-10,22.

C: 7,1-40; 8,1-13 (9,1-18); 9,19-23; 10,23-11,1; 12,1-14,40; 16,1-12.

D: 1,1-4,21⁽¹¹⁾.

⁽⁸⁾ W. SCHMITHALS, *Die Gnosis in Korinth* (FRLANT NF 48; Göttingen ³1969) 81-94.

⁽⁹⁾ W. SCHENK, «Der 1 Korintherbrief als Briefsammlung», *ZNW* 60 (1969) 219-243 (cf. 241).

⁽¹⁰⁾ W. SCHMITHALS, «Die Korintherbriefe als Briefsammlung», *ZNW* 64 (1973) 263-288 (cf. 288, n. 70).

⁽¹¹⁾ Chr. SENFT, *La première épître de Saint-Paul aux Corinthiens* (CNT 2ème série VII; Neuchâtel-Paris 1979) 19.

También cerca de estos, M. Widmann propone siete cartas:

A. (*Anfangsphase*)

A1: I 11,2-34; 16,7-9,15-20.

A2: II 6,14-7,1; I 9,24-10,22; 6,1-11; 5; 6,12-20.

A3: I 15,1-44a.49-58; 16,1-7a.11-14.

B. (*Verschärfungsphase*)

B1: I 9,1-18; II 2,14-6,13; 7,2-4.

B2: I 1,1-2,5; 3,1-4,21; II 10-13.

C. (*Klärungsphase*): I 7,1-35; 8,1-13; 9,19-22; 10,23-11,1; 12,1-31a; 14,1c-40; 12,31b-13,13; II 9.

D. (*Entspannungsphase*): II 1,1-2,13; 7,5-8,24⁽¹²⁾.

Sin duda que podrían multiplicarse las referencias a las supuestas cartas que se encuentran en el interior de nuestra 1 Cor⁽¹³⁾. Sin embargo creemos que a modo de «muestra» bastan los ejemplos señalados. De aquí, sin embargo, podemos destacar algunas conclusiones:

1. La variedad de propuestas de «cartas originales» atenta contra la verosimilitud de las mismas.

2. Así como —frente a su «reconstrucción» del Cuarto Evangelio— se ha hablado del «Evangelio según Bultmann»⁽¹⁴⁾, si los criterios de estructuración no se establecieran en base a elementos literarios (cosa más evidente en las propuestas de 2 Cor) no estaríamos lejos de poder hablar de la «Carta según Schmithals/Schenk...». No debería olvidarse que las propuestas de estructuras

⁽¹²⁾ M. WIDMANN, «I Kor 2,6-16: Ein Einspruch gegen Paulus», *ZNW* 70 (1979) 44-53 (cf. p. 51, n. 18).

⁽¹³⁾ Así también, E. Dinkler, A. Suhl, H. M. Schenke-K. M. Fischer, Jewett, Harrison... Un estado de la cuestión puede verse en SCHENK, «Der 1 Korintherbrief», 219-221 y en MERKLEIN «Die Einheitlichkeit», 154-156. Sobre la 2 Cor, lo más reciente es Ph. ROLLAND, «La structure littéraire de la Deuxième Epître aux Corinthiens», *Bib* 71 (1990) 73-84 (sin bibliografía), aunque aquí sólo busca justificar en detalle la propuesta hecha anteriormente (cf. M. CARREZ, *Introducción a la lectura de la Biblia* 8 (ed. E. CHARPENTIER y A. PAUL) (Madrid 1985) 67-88 sin indicar la fuente); para un «status quaestionis» V. P. FURNISH, *II Corinthians* (AB 32A; Garden City, NY 1984).

⁽¹⁴⁾ Cf. R. BROWN, *El Evangelio según Juan* (Madrid 1979) I, 27.

deben ser en base a criterios literarios, y «el análisis literario debería preceder a la interpretación»⁽¹⁵⁾.

3. La sugerencia de diferentes informantes (que se concluye de la misma carta) que proponen Héring, Schmithals y Senft entre otros, no debe dejarse de lado apresuradamente.

4. Algunos pasajes (como cap. 13 o 14,[33b]34-35) parecen presentar «faltas de coherencia» literarias más evidentes que otras «faltas de coherencia» temáticas que, quizás, podrían explicarse de otra manera (como 2,6-16).

2. ¿Una carta única?

Por otro lado, muchos autores como Robertson-Plummer ya en 1914, A. Brunot, J. C. Hurd, J. Cambier, B. Rigaux, W. Marxen, M. Thrall, C. K. Barrett, D. Mollat, H. Conzelmann, W. G. Kümmel, E. Lohse, A. Wikenhauser-J. Schmid, W. Orr-J. Walther, U. Vanni, K. Bailey, H. Merklein, J. C. Brunt, E. E. Ellis, M. Mitchell... se inclinan por la unidad interna de la carta (y ciertamente esta lista no es completa)⁽¹⁶⁾. Los motivos son sumamente diversos

⁽¹⁵⁾ L. RIVAS, «El plan de la epístola a los Gálatas», *Teología* 13 (1976) 124; «L'architecture d'un texte du Nouveau Testament ne peut se faire qu'à partir de critères objectifs», ROLLAND, «Structure littéraire», 73.

⁽¹⁶⁾ ROBERTSON-PLUMMER, *Corinthians* (ICC; Edinburgh 21914) XXIV; A. BRUNOT, *Le génie littéraire de saint Paul* (Paris 1955) 42ss.; J. CAMBIER, *Introducción a la Biblia* (ed. ROBERT-FEUILLET) (Barcelona 31970) II, 392; B. RIGAU, *Saint Paul et ses lettres* (Paris-Bruges 1962) 157; J. C. HURD, *The Origins of 1 Corinthians* (Mercer Univ. Press 1983; repr.) 64-94; W. MARXEN, *Introducción al Nuevo Testamento* (Salamanca 1983) 86; M. THRALL, *I and II Corinthians* (The Cambridge Bible Commentary; Cambridge 1965) 13; C. K. BARRETT, *La Prima lettera ai Corinti* (Bologna 1979) 26-27; D. MOLLAT, *Introductio in Epistolas Sancti Pauli* (Roma 41968) 68-70; H. CONZELMANN, *1 Corinthians* (Philadelphia 21981) 4; R. B. BROWN, *1 Corinthians* (The Broadman Bible Comm. vol. 10; Nashville 1970) 289; KÜMMEL, *Introduction*, 275-278; E. LOHSE, *Introducción al Nuevo Testamento* (Madrid 1975) 71; WIKENHAUSER-SCHMID, *Introducción*, 650; W. ORR-J. WALTHER, *1 Corinthians* (AB 32; Garden City, NY 1982) 121; U. VANNI, «La primera carta a los Corintios: del 'discurso de la cruz' a la eclesialidad», *Problemas y Perspectivas de las ciencias bíblicas*. (ed. R. FABRIS) (Salamanca 1983) 301-314 (espec. 311); K. BAILEY, «The Structure of 1 Corinthians and Paul's Theological Method with Special Reference to 4:17», *NT* 25 (1983) 152-181 (espec. 181); MERKLEIN, «Die Einheitlichkeit», 153-183; J. C. BRUNT, «Rejected, Ignored, or Misunderstood? The

y van, «negativamente» desde la falta de pruebas conclusivas por la división (Conzelmann), la falta de criterios crítico-literarios (Marxen), la cantidad de propuestas como signo de ausencia de argumentos (Rigaux) o la falta de fuerza concluyente en los argumentos (Wikenhauser-Schmid, Barrett, Kümmel, Brunt) por un lado, y «positivamente», encontrar un plan teológico de conjunto (Vanni), un «edificio intelectual admirable» (Bailey) o inconexiones explicables por las circunstancias (Cambier, Conzelmann, Lohse, Orr-Walther, Mitchell), o por la incorporación de elementos tradicionales (Ellis).

Algunos autores, no dejan clara su opinión, o parecen haberla cambiado: es el caso de G. Bornkamm que afirmaba que los argumentos en favor de la división no son convincentes⁽¹⁷⁾, mientras duda, más tarde, de la unicidad⁽¹⁸⁾. Menos claro es M. Carrez, que en 1976 hace suyas las palabras de G. Friedrich citadas más arriba⁽¹⁹⁾ con lo que parece optar por la unidad; en una nueva obra (1983) parece inclinarse por la postura de Schmithals en «*Gnosis*» (a pesar que manifestaba conocerla desde antes)⁽²⁰⁾. Sin embargo, recientemente parece suponer nuevamente una carta única⁽²¹⁾.

Lo hasta aquí señalado, también nos permite extraer algunos elementos:

1. Las circunstancias de composición de la carta son sumamente complejas y podrían —con mayor o menor seguridad según el párrafo— dar razón de ser a la «falta de coherencia». En este caso,

Fate of Paul's Approach to the Problem of Food Offered to Idols in Early Christianity», *NTS* 31 (1985) 122, n.2; E. E. ELLIS, «Traditions in 1 Corinthians», *NTS* 32 (1986) 481-502; M. MITCHELL, «Concerning 'peri de' in 1 Corinthians», *NT* 31 (1989) 229-256.

⁽¹⁷⁾ G. BORNKAMM, *Pablo de Tarso* (Salamanca 21982) 307 (el original es de 1969); id., «Eucaristía e Iglesia en san Pablo. Excursus 1: sobre la cuestión de la integridad literaria de 1 Cor 10,1-22», *Estudios sobre el Nuevo Testamento* (Salamanca 1983) 140-142 (el original es de 1956, pero la presente edición utiliza bibliografía de 1969).

⁽¹⁸⁾ G. BORNKAMM, *El Nuevo Testamento y la historia del cristianismo primitivo* (Salamanca 1975) 106 (el original es de 1971).

⁽¹⁹⁾ M. CARREZ, *Introduction à la Bible*, édition nouvelle (ed. A. GEORGE-P. GRELOT) (Paris 1977) III/3; 51-81 (esp. 57, n. 11); cf. nota 1.

⁽²⁰⁾ Id., *Introducción*, 63-112 (esp. 91); cfr. *Introducción*, 60, n. 19.

⁽²¹⁾ Id., *La segunda carta a los Corintios* (Cuaderno Bíblico 51; Navarra 1986) 7.

las circunstancias explicarían mejor que la multiplicidad de cartas el problema de la «ruptura». No debería descuidarse este punto.

2. Las «admirables estructuras» no parecen tener seguidores, lo que invita a dudar si no se corre el riesgo de estructuras según Bailey/Barrett/Vanni... No debe olvidarse que si bien no se han presentado «rupturas» con criterios literarios, tampoco las propuestas de unicidad presentan estructuras con criterios literarios.

3. Algunas propuestas de unidad (caps. 1-4) presentan bastante más probabilidad de certeza que otras (caps. 8-11).

4. El uso de elementos tradicionales (evidente en casos como 11,23-25; 15,3-5) no debe dejarse de lado apresuradamente, aunque deben seguirse criterios lo más objetivos posibles (desde «afuera»), para evitar caer en círculos viciosos.

3. ¿Interpolaciones?

Como señalamos en la introducción, se ha propuesto recientemente encontrar interpolaciones en nuestra actual 1 Cor. J. Murphy-O'Connor, en la obra que hemos citado, indica que las supuestas interpolaciones las encontraríamos en los siguientes párrafos: 2,6-16; 4,6; 6,14; 11,3-16; 14,34-35; 15,31-32; 15,44b-48; después de analizarlas una a una, opina que sólo 4,6 y 14,34s lo son. W. Munro propone, a modo de criterios para detectar las interpolaciones, nueve elementos tomados en su mayor parte de las leyes para la crítica textual⁽²²⁾. Si bien no propone textos interpolados que nos interesen⁽²³⁾, supone el elemento «pastoral» como clave para considerarlos no-paulinos. Sin embargo, no son muchos los que coinciden con esto. Como decíamos, Murphy-O'Connor sólo ve dos interpolaciones (y en la primera de ellas —4,6— su argumento no parece muy convincente) lo que haría un total de solo tres versículos interpolados. La segunda interpolación (14,34-35 —o desde v.33b)

⁽²²⁾ Los criterios que propone son: 1. evidencia textual directa; 2. diferencia en tendencias ideológicas; 3. diferencias estilístico/lingüísticas; 4. problemas contextuales; 5. dependencia literaria; 6. coherencia literaria o histórica; 7. omisión en testificación externa; 8. posibilidad contextual; 9. posibilidad histórica. Cf. MUNRO, «Interpolation», 438-439.

⁽²³⁾ Lo hace en otra obra, *Authority in Paul and Peter. The Identification of a Pastoral Stratum in the Pauline Corpus and 1 Peter* (Cambridge 1983).

parece más probable: el mismo lenguaje y modo de argumentación (desde la ley) no parece paulino, y no son convincentes los intentos de armonizarlo con 11,2-16 con el que parece entrar en contradicción⁽²⁴⁾. No todos coinciden en dónde comienza la interpolación (v. 33b?) o dónde concluye (v. 36?)⁽²⁵⁾; y algunos, ciertamente, se niegan a considerarlo interpolado⁽²⁶⁾. Por otra parte, hay quienes sugieren ver aquí (y en otras partes) restos de «slogans» de los corintios, o parte de la carta que la comunidad envía a Pablo⁽²⁷⁾. Murphy-O'Connor, que ha trabajado en otras partes los posibles «slogan» corintios⁽²⁸⁾, sólo propone 6,12a.13a.18b; 7,1b; 8,1b.4b.8; 10,23; 11,2 y 15,29 como tales⁽²⁹⁾. Si Pablo citara un «slogan» que no hace suyo, es extraño que no lo corrija desde su perspectiva; no tiene sentido que cite un «slogan» sin la correspondiente crítica a esta postura. Los aparentes «slogan» que Pablo cita, van acompañados de correcciones: *all' ouk* (6,12b.d; 8,7; 10,23b.d) o *dè* (6,13b.18c; 7,2; 8,1c.9; 11,3). Si, en cambio, no lo criticara por coincidir con él, permanecería la contradicción con 11,3-16. Nos parece preferible suponer que estamos frente a la única interpolación en 1 Cor.

(24) Cf. SENFT, *1 Cor*, 182-183: 1. el sujeto no tiene relación con el de caps. 12-14; 2. estos vv. interrumpen las instrucciones sobre los profetas; 3. están en contradicción con 11,5; 4. la ley como regla disciplinaria no es algo paulino.

(25) La mayoría propone comenzar en v. 33b; Barrett y Murphy-O'Connor en 34; Conzelmann propone concluir en v. 36.

(26) E. SCHÜSSLER FIORENZA, *In Memory of Her* (New York 1983) 230-233; id. «Rhetorical Situation and Historical Reconstruction in 1 Corinthians», *NTS* 33 (1987) 386-403 (esp. 403, n. 50).

(27) N. FLANAGAN-E. H. SNYDER, «Did Paul Put Down Women in 1 Cor 14,34-36?», *BTB* 11 (1981) 10-11; D. W. ODELL-SCOTT, «Let the Women Speak in Church: An Egalitarian Interpretation of 1 Cor 14,33b-36», *BTB* 13 (1983) 90-93.

(28) «Corinthian Slogans in 1 Cor 6,12-20», *CBQ* 40 (1978) 394; «Baptized for the Dead (1 Cor XV,29). A Corinthian Slogan?», *RB* (1981) 532-543.

(29) «Interpolations», 92, n. 40; cf. también HURD, *Origins of 1 Cor*, 119-123, aunque extrema el planteo y cree posible (y propone) reconstruir la carta de los corintios. No necesariamente los slogan corintios debían llegar a Pablo por la carta, también cuenta la tradición oral. CONZELMANN, *1 Cor*, 7 y n. 54 agrega 8,5-6, y no considera 6,18 como parte de la carta de los corintios.

De aquí podemos extraer nuevas conclusiones:

1. El criterio para detectar supuestas interpolaciones debe establecerse desde «fuera» para evitar entrar en un círculo hermenéutico «vicioso» que termine encontrando los presupuestos de los que se partió.

Aunque haya que admitir que son lícitas las hipótesis sobre la preexistencia de un hecho, de una doctrina, de un 'motivo' o de un tema, cuando encierran alguna utilidad para explicar los hechos, doctrinas o motivos que de lo contrario se quedarían sin explicación, esto no hace por otra parte que sea lícito llegar a círculos viciosos en donde lo que hay que explicar (en nuestro caso, las supuestas interpolaciones) se convierta en la explicación de otros hechos (...) que podrían ser muy bien por el contrario la base o el pretexto de ulteriores desarrollos⁽³⁰⁾.

2. Algunos textos (14,34-35) son más fácilmente calificables de interpolaciones que otros (2,6-16) que pueden atribuirse a otra variedad de razones⁽³¹⁾. También aquí debemos tener en cuenta criterios literarios.

3. Debemos evitar continuamente considerar interpolado lo que no es coherente con lo que creemos que Pablo dice; eso sería también enfrentarse al riesgo de una carta a «nuestra imagen y semejanza».

4. ¿Un criterio literario de estructuración?

En 7,1 vemos que Pablo responde a una carta que le han enviado los corintios sobre determinados aspectos. Comienza a responder usando el término *peri de*. Dado que el término vuelve a repetirse, se ha sugerido que allí donde lo encontramos estamos frente a las diferentes respuestas de Pablo a las preguntas por escrito de los corintios. En ese sentido, el término *peri de* se transformaría en un criterio literario de estructuración de la carta. Las «faltas de coheren-

⁽³⁰⁾ U. BIANCHI, «La literatura gnóstica y el Nuevo Testamento», *Problemas y Perspectivas*, 125.

⁽³¹⁾ Un «*excursus*», H. LIETZMANN-W.G. KÜMMEL, *An die Korinther I/II* (HNT; Tübingen 1949) ad 9,19-23; KÜMMEL, *Introduction*, 278; un «*midrash*», ELLIS, «Traditions in 1 Cor», 490-491; terminología de los gnósticos corintios, R. BULTMANN, *Teología del Nuevo Testamento* (Salamanca 1981) 235; cfr. WIDMANN, «1 Kor 2,6-16».

cia» — muchas de ellas — se explicarían sencillamente por la situación: son diferentes respuestas a diferentes preguntas... Esto ha llevado a dividir la carta en 7,1 (pregunta sobre el matrimonio), 7,25 (pregunta sobre las vírgenes); 8,1 (sobre la carne inmolata a los ídolos); 12,1 (sobre los «espirituales»); 16,1 (sobre la colecta) y 16,12 (sobre Apolo). Sin embargo, esta propuesta no da respuesta a todos los interrogantes planteados: tanto los que ven en 1 Cor un «mosaico de cartas»⁽³²⁾ como quienes se inclinan por la unidad⁽³³⁾ aceptan que *perì de* es un criterio estructurante; de esta manera, seguimos sin respuesta frente al interrogante sobre la unidad o no de la carta. Otros elementos a tener en cuenta, y a los que hay que dar respuesta son: ¿por qué empieza a contestar recién en 7,1 si la carta es una unidad?, *perì de* ¿es el único término usado para contestar los diferentes interrogantes, o hay otros?. E. Schüssler Fiorenza, que propone que 1 Cor es un discurso retórico deliberativo, cree que esa es la razón por la cual la respuesta se retrasa hasta el cap. 7⁽³⁴⁾; M. Mitchell, que también se inclina por la unidad de la carta, después de estudiar el término *perì de* en la literatura antigua, concluye que este no es definitorio para sacar conclusiones, y que pueden encontrarse otros términos como *thelô gar hymas agnoein* (10,1) y *gnôrizô de hymin* (15,1) para detectar la respuesta de Pablo a la carta corintia⁽³⁵⁾. Concluamos diciendo que:

1. *perì de*, probablemente, es un criterio literario estructurante. El término indica (no necesariamente de un modo exclusivo) dónde comienzan las distintas respuestas que Pablo hace a los interrogantes escritos de los corintios.

2. No debe dejarse de lado que el retraso hasta 7,1 para contestar la carta corintia debe encontrar una respuesta coherente. El género literario no parece suficiente.

3. *perì de* no da respuesta a todos los interrogantes sobre la estructuración de la carta: no sólo queda sin aclararse el lugar de los

⁽³²⁾ Así Weiß, Cleary, Schmithals («*Antwortbrief*»), Schenk, Senft y relativamente (excluye el c. 16) Widmann.

⁽³³⁾ Así Hurd, Merklein, Orr-Walther; Conzelmann.

⁽³⁴⁾ «*Rhetorical Situation*», 386-403 (espec. 393-397).

⁽³⁵⁾ MITCHELL, «Concerning 'peri de'», 229-256 (espec. 254-255). Creemos, sin embargo, que la autora sólo prueba lo que es posible que sea, y no lo que de hecho es. No nos parece, en este caso, que *thelô gar hymas agnoein* y *gnôrizô de hymin* sean respuesta a una pregunta.

caps. 1-6, sino también de 11,2-34 y cap. 15; y no es clara la coherencia literaria en los caps. 8-10 y cap. 13.

4. La fuente de información oral puede dar algunas respuestas (Cloe, Estéfanos) pero deberían precisarse.

II. Ensayo de propuesta

En base a los criterios señalados, y a los puntos que hemos indicado proponemos la posibilidad de que nuestra actual 1 Carta a los Corintios presente en su interior la siguiente trama.

Frente a los interrogantes corintios, Pablo responde por escrito a sus preguntas (criterio del *perì de*); sin embargo, antes de remitir las respuestas, recibe oralmente la información (¿desde otro enfoque o punto de vista?) de que la situación o se ha agravado, o es más crítica de lo que Pablo supone. Esto lleva al Apóstol a interpolar, él mismo, una serie de elementos a su carta original. Finalmente, una tercera mano redaccional, interpola 14,33b-35 (o vv.34-35). Desarrollemos un poco estas ideas.

No sabemos si la carta a Pablo fue llevada por Estéfanos como se ha supuesto frecuentemente, pero sabemos que él se encuentra junto al Apóstol (16,15-18; cf. 1,16). Tampoco sabemos mucho acerca de «los de Cloe». No sabemos si Cloe es de Corinto o de Efeso, si son parientes, esclavos, o incluso se ha sugerido que pueden ser los (del partido) de Cloe, o los informantes oficiales de la comunidad⁽³⁶⁾. No deberían, entonces, sacarse demasiadas conclusiones de los dos «informantes», y concluir, por ejemplo, que pertenecen a diferentes estratos sociales y, por lo tanto, a diferentes puntos de vista del mismo problema. Pablo, entonces, miraría las cosas desde «los de Cloe»⁽³⁷⁾. Es cierto que el Apóstol se ha hecho «débil con los débiles» (9,22), pero si los de Cloe y Estéfanos representaran diferentes estratos sociales, y Pablo toma partido por uno de ellos (los de Cloe) no se ve por qué motivo exalta la figura de Estéfanos

⁽³⁶⁾ Cf. F. R. HITCHCOCK, «Who are 'the people of Chloe' in 1 Cor 1,11?», *JTS* 25 (1923) 163-167; SCHÜSSLER FIORENZA, «Rhetorical Situation», 395.

⁽³⁷⁾ Cf. G. THEISSEN, «Estratificación social de la comunidad de Corinto», *Sociología del cristianismo primitivo* (Salamanca 1985) 193, 214s. (publicación original en *ZNW* 65 [1974] 232-272); W. A. MEEKS, *The First Urban Christians. The Social World of the Apostle Paul* (New Haven 1986) 59.

(«sepan apreciar a estos hombres» 16,18). Sería extraño que Estéfanas y sus compañeros se limitaran a entregar una carta (si es que son ellos los portadores) sin comentar la situación, pero no es improbable que la crisis hubiera empeorado, y además, surgieran nuevos elementos. Sea como sea, Pablo enfrentará la situación urgiéndolos al amor (algo que ya estaba presente en la respuesta a la carta; cf. 8,1). Es la aplicación práctica de lo que ya E. Troeltsch llamó «patriarcalismo del amor»⁽³⁸⁾.

Proponemos, entonces, que al informarse de la (¿nueva?) situación Pablo se ve obligado a incorporar nuevos elementos, que en este caso, dan respuesta a situaciones concretas (los «partidos corintios», la situación incestuosa de un miembro, el recurso a los tribunales paganos). Creemos que los elementos incorporados posteriormente por Pablo deben encontrarse en los caps. 1-6; 11,2-34; 12,31b-14,1a; 15; 16,13-24 (aunque no es improbable encontrar añadidos en los caps. 9-10). Por otra parte, la carta original la encontraríamos en 1,1-9⁽³⁹⁾; 7,1-11,1 (sobre estos caps. volveremos); 12,1-31a; 14,1b-33a.36-40; 16,1-12.

Cada una de estas perícopas, presenta una serie muy variada de interrogantes, y la bibliografía sobre ellas es muy extensa. No podemos, por lo tanto, extendernos aquí en cada una, sin embargo, insinuaremos algunos aspectos que nos parecen importantes.

1. La *falta de coherencia* en más de una parte quedaría, creemos, suficientemente explicada si pensamos en interpolaciones posteriores; pero en más de un caso, necesariamente, esta debe considerarse paulina: es el caso del cap. 13, que evidentemente rompe la

(38) E. TROELTSCH, *Gesammelte Schriften*. Vol: I: *Die Soziallehren der christlichen Kirchen und Gruppen* (Tübingen 1923) 67-83. De él procede el concepto «en cuanto al contenido» según THEISSEN, «Estratificación social», 230, n.91. Sin embargo, su óptica ha recibido algunas críticas de T. ENGBERG-PEDERSEN, «The Gospel and Social Practice in 1 Corinthians», *NTS* 33 (1987) 559-560. Usamos el término sin coincidir necesariamente con el contenido que Theissen le atribuye.

(39) Los temas insinuados en la acción de gracias corresponden, fundamentalmente, a los que desarrollará en la carta de respuesta. Cf. MARXEN, *Introducción*, 34; BROWN, *1 Cor*, 299; G. FINKENRATH, «libro, epistolè», *Diccionario Teológico del Nuevo Testamento* (ed. L. COENEN-E. BEREUTHER-H. BIETENHARD) (Salamanca 1980) II, 444; J.T. SANDERS, «The Transition from Opening Epistolary Thanksgiving to Body in the Letters of the Pauline Corpus», *JBL* 81 (1962) 348-362.

unidad literaria (12,31a sigue naturalmente en 14,1b) pero es claro que sigue enfocando el mismo problema («lenguas», «profecía», «gnosis»...). De allí que casi nadie deje de considerarlo paulino, aunque, como podemos ver más arriba en las diferentes propuestas de «mosaico de cartas», muchos lo consideran originalmente independiente⁽⁴⁰⁾; creemos, sin embargo, que la estrecha relación con lo que antecede y prosigue, nos lleva a concluir que el texto se encuentra en el lugar adecuado. Si Pablo empieza a responder al interrogante de la carta (en este caso, el papel de los *pneumatikoi*)⁽⁴¹⁾ y luego descubre que la «vocación» natural de los corintios a la división y la discordia se ha acentuado, o que el problema es más serio de lo que él pensaba o sabía, no es improbable que busque, ya no establecer una escala de valores a los ministerios y los dones del espíritu (caps. 12 y 14), sino establecer un elemento superador de las distancias: «el patriarcalismo del amor» (cap. 13). Es aquí que incorpora entonces, el llamado «himno a la caridad»⁽⁴²⁾.

La conformación social y étnica de la comunidad corintia, parecía predisponerla «naturalmente» a la división; no en vano todavía en tiempos de Clemente Romano la comunidad continúa dividida⁽⁴³⁾; Pablo, por otra parte, conoce ya una cierta división interna

⁽⁴⁰⁾ Véanse las propuestas de Weiß, Schmithals, Schenk, Widmann; también Conzelmann. El único autor que conocemos que niega la autenticidad paulina a 1 Cor 13 es E. L. TITUS, «Did Paul Write I Cor 13?», *JBR* 27 (1959) 299-302.

⁽⁴¹⁾ Cf. J. PAINTER, «Paul and the 'Pneumatikoi' at Corinth», *Paul and Paulinism. Essays in honour of C.K. Barrett* (ed. M.D. HOOKER—S.G. WILSON) (London 1982) 237-250.

⁽⁴²⁾ Cf. G. BORNKAMM, «El camino más excelente», *Estudios sobre el NT*, 37-58; R. KIEFFER, *Le primat de l'amour (1 Cor 13)* (LD 85; Paris 1975); O. WISCHMEYER, *Der höchste Weg (1 Kor 13)*, (Gütersloh 1981); B. STANDAERT, «1 Corinthiens 13», *Charisma und Agape (1 Ko 12-14)* (Hrsg. L. DELORENZI) (Roma 1983); R. SCHNACKENBURG, *Die sittliche Botschaft des Neuen Testament*, (HTKNT Supp./I; Freiburg-Basel-Wien 1986) 213-224: «In der Frage, woher dieses Hohelied stammt, darf man sich ohne Zögern für Paulus als Verfasser entscheiden... Vielleicht hat Paulus schon vorher einen ähnlichen Hymnus konzipiert; aber das vorliegende Lied läßt sich am besten als eine ad hoc entworfene Dichtung begreifen» (217).

⁽⁴³⁾ No entramos aquí en el controvertido tema de la fecha de los llamados «Padres Apostólicos», y particularmente, de Clemente; cf. ELLIS, «Traditions in 1 Cor», 500, n. 87; J. RIUS CAMPS, «Ignacio de Antioquía, ¿testigo ocular de la muerte y resurrección de Jesús?», *Bib* 70 (1989) 449-473.

por la carta corintia (caps. 8 y 12); frente a esto aplica desde el comienzo como criterio el «patriarcalismo del amor», dado que «la ciencia hincha, el amor edifica» (8,1), «el cuerpo es uno» (12,12). Pero Pablo se entera, «por los de Cloe», que en Corinto, la división es seria; y por eso se decide a enfrentar desde el comienzo el problema; así se entiende que se retrase hasta 7,1 la respuesta a la carta de la comunidad. La división es, para Pablo, algo intolerable y su respuesta se centra en la unidad (sacramental-bautismal) «en Cristo»⁽⁴⁴⁾. Creemos, sin embargo, que Pablo no critica un «partido» en especial (aunque pueda criticar alguno de sus planteos), critica el hecho de que haya partidos; «no demuestra más preferencia por quienes dicen ser ‘de Pablo’ que por quienes dicen ser ‘de Apolo’ o ‘de Cefas’»⁽⁴⁵⁾.

La fama moral de Corinto distaba de ser buena. Frecuentemente se citan autores que, como Epícteto, refieren a la relajación de las costumbres en esta ciudad: «¿Has nacido para agradar a las mujeres sin retenerlas? ¡Hazte ciudadano de Corinto!», aunque algunos au-

⁽⁴⁴⁾ La bibliografía sobre los «partidos» corintios es extremadamente abundante, vease PAINTER, «Paul and the ‘Pneumatikoi’»; G. SELLIN, «Das ‘Geheimnis’ der Weisheit und das Rätsel der ‘Christuspartei’ (zu 1 Kor 1-4)», *ZNW* 73 (1982) 69-96; ENGBERG-PEDERSEN, «The Gospel and Social Practice», 557-584 (espec. 560-573); R. TREVIANO ETCHEVERRÍA, «El contraste de sabidurías (1 Cor 1,17-4,20)», *Salman* 34 (1987) 277-298; cf. T. H. LIM, «Not in persuasive words of wisdom, but in the demonstration of the Spirit and power», *NT* 29 (1987) 137, n. 2; por citar la más reciente. Muchos autores, prefieren suponer que Pablo critica particularmente a un «partido»: A los de *Apolo* (WIKENHAUSER-SCHMID, *Introducción*, 642, n. 46; Weiß; Montefiore [crítica a la carta a los Hebreos, escrita por Apolo] [citado por BARRETT, *1 Cor*, 19-21]; SELLIN, «Das ‘Geheimnis’», 74). A los de *Pedro* (C. K. BARRETT, «Cephas and Corinth», *Abraham Unser Vater* (FS. O. Michel; [eds. O. BETZ et al.] Leiden 1963) 1-12; P. VIELHAUER, «Paulus und die Kephaspartei in Korinth», *NTS* 21 [1974-75] 344). A los de *Cristo* (SCHMITHALS, *Gnosis in Korinth*).

N. A. DAHL, *Studies in Paul. Theology for the Early Christian Mission* (Minneapolis 1977) 329, ha propuesto que 1-4 es una apología de Pablo (cf. J. B. CHANCE, «Paul’s Apology to the Corinthians», *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 9 [1982] 144-155); sugiere que la duda era a quien remitir la carta, si a Pedro, a Pablo, a Apolo... Finalmente, los de Cloe (según E. SCHÜSSLER FIORENZA: «los mensajeros oficiales de la comunidad») la remiten a Pablo. Eso motiva que Pablo realice en 1-4 una apología sobre su verdadero lugar en la comunidad.

⁽⁴⁵⁾ R. BROWN et al., *Pedro en el Nuevo Testamento* (Santander 1976) 40. De modo semejante, BORNKAMM, *El Nuevo Testamento*, 108.

tores piensan que su situación no era más grave que en el resto de los puertos mediterráneos⁽⁴⁶⁾. Sea lo que sea, podemos afirmar que en Corinto comenzaron a vivirse determinadas situaciones que Pablo no esperaba se dieran entre perfectos (*teleiois*) (2,6), *pneumatikois* ya no *psychikois* (2,13-14); ahora no le queda más remedio que hablarles como a carnales (*sarkinois*) y niños (*nêpiois*) (3,1). Sin embargo, los corintios se hinchan (*pephysiômenoî*) (5,2) —lo cual es bastante característico de ellos (4,6.18.19; 5,2; 8,1; 13,4). Su situación moral es preocupante, y no de otra cosa hablan los caps. 1-4 y 5-6⁽⁴⁷⁾. Ese es el motivo por el cual encontramos en sólo dos capítulos, tres catálogos de vicios (5,11; 6,9-10; cf. 5,10), y hay una evidente referencia al mundo que los rodea (5,10), y a lo que los mismos corintios vivieron antes de recibir el Evangelio (6,11; cf. 6,20; 12,2); es hacia ese pasado que parecen volver.

En la comunidad, realmente no existía la unidad; y si en algún momento esto era particularmente visible, es en las reuniones comunitarias; pero para Pablo esa «no es nuestra costumbre ni la de las Iglesias de Dios» (11,16) y «esto no es la Cena del Señor» (11,20). Los desórdenes en la asamblea comunitaria, son especialmente intolerables⁽⁴⁸⁾.

Finalmente, la duda, o la negación de la resurrección —un texto que ocupa un lugar importante en la carta, pero no está anunciado ni estructurado literariamente en el contexto— parece ser otra información que Pablo recibe y enfrenta vehementemente: «¿cómo

⁽⁴⁶⁾ SENFT, *1 Cor*, 15 hace suyas las palabras de Epícteto (*Diálogos* III.33s); J. MURPHY-O'CONNOR, en cambio, prefiere opinar que «in terms of sexual morality, Corinth was no worse than any other Mediterranean port»: «The First Letter to the Corinthians», *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary* (eds. R. E. BROWN—J. A. FITZMYER—R. E. MURPHY) (Englewood Cliffs, NJ 1990) 799.

⁽⁴⁷⁾ Cf. P. S. ZAAS, «Catalogues and Context: 1 Corinthians 5 and 6», *NTS* 34 (1988) 622-629; M. Y. MACDONALD, «Women Holy in Body and Spirit», *NTS* 36 (1990) 161-181; R. B. WARD, «Musonius and Paul on Marriage», *NTS* 36 (1990) 281-289; cfr. la obra colectiva (congrès de l'AC-FEB, Tarbes 1981) *Le Corps et le Corps du Christ dans la Première épître aux Corinthiens* (LD 114; Paris 1983).

⁽⁴⁸⁾ ENGBERG-PEDERSEN, «The Gospel and Social Practice», 576-577; S. C. BARTON, «Paul's Sense of Place: An Anthropological Approach to Community Formation in Corinth», *NTS* 32 (1986) 225-246 (espec. 234-242); E. DE LA SERNA, «¿"ver - juzgar - actuar" en San Pablo?», *RevisitB* 52 (1990) 85-98 (esp. 95-97).

andan diciendo algunos de ustedes que no hay resurrección de los muertos?» (15,12)⁽⁴⁹⁾.

2. Suponemos que Pablo, al enterarse del *agravamiento de la situación* (nos parece preferible hablar de «agravamiento» y no de «nueva perspectiva», a la luz del evidente agravamiento detectable en 2 Cor), la enfrenta como un verdadero retroceso de los cristianos corintios: se han vuelto «niños» (3,1; cf. 13,11), humanos y carnales; han experimentado una «vuelta atrás»: actúan como paganos, como habiendo recibido el «espíritu del mundo» y no el «espíritu de Dios» (2,12): decadencia moral; recurso a los tribunales, dudas sobre la resurrección, divisiones... Pablo, entonces, como elemento crítico, recurre a una fórmula muy usada en esta carta: «¿no saben?» (*ouk oïdate*: 3,16; 5,6; 6,2.3.9.15.16.19; 9,13.24; como puede verse, salvo las referencias al cap. 9, sobre el cual volveremos, todas pertenecen a las unidades que hemos considerado interpoladas). La respuesta a la pregunta es evidente, es una actitud que busca remitirlos al origen de su fe⁽⁵⁰⁾.

En este mismo sentido, notamos probable, con E. E. Ellis, la incorporación de elementos tradicionales: luego de establecer cuatro criterios para detectar dichos elementos⁽⁵¹⁾ propone remitir a «*Tradiciones de Jesús*» las referencias al divorcio (7,10), al pago de los trabajadores (9,14), a la Eucaristía (11,23) y la tipología del cuerpo y el templo (3,16; 6,19; 10,16; 12.12.27); aunque, a nuestro juicio, algunas de ellas no son tan evidentes (el tema del «Cuerpo de Cris-

⁽⁴⁹⁾ A. J. M. WEDDERBURN, «The Problem of the Denial of the Resurrection in 1 Corinthians XV», *NT* 23 (1981) 229-241; R. TREVIJANO ETCHEVERRÍA, «Los que dicen que no hay resurrección», *Salman* 33 (1986) 277-302; J. LAMBRECHT, «Structure and Line of Thought in 1 Cor 15,23-28», *NT* 32 (1990) 143-151.

⁽⁵⁰⁾ «The phrase, 'do you not know', a favourite idiom of (the amanuensis of) 1 Corinthians, often refers to an aspect of Christian teaching that the Corinthians are expected to have learned, in all likelihood an aspect that they had previously been taught by Paul or one of his co-workers». ELLIS, «Traditions in 1 Cor», 487; cf. LOHSE, *Introducción*, 68.

⁽⁵¹⁾ ELLIS, «Traditions in 1 Cor», 485; propone: 1. presencia de fórmulas que indiquen que una tradición antecedente es citada; 2. naturaleza auto-contenida de un pasaje independiente de su contexto; 3. la frecuencia relativa de vocabulario, idioma, estilo o expresión teológica que difiera del resto de la carta o del corpus paulino en general; 4. la presencia en otros escritos contemporáneos de diferente autor de una pieza marcadamente similar en la que no sea probable una dependencia literaria directa.

to», por ejemplo, es lo suficientemente complejo —y evidentemente paulino—, que no resulta fácil resumirlo en unas pocas palabras⁽⁵²⁾; nos parece más original de Pablo que propio de tradiciones de Jesús). En general, estas tradiciones se limitan a un simple elemento o idea, salvo el caso, evidentemente tradicional, del relato de la «Cena del Señor» («recibí... lo que he transmitido» 11,23). Ellis señala otras tradiciones, más importantes a nuestro juicio: «*Midrashim*» (pp. 490-491) (2,6-16 y 10,1-18), «*Reglas de la Comunidad*» (pp. 491-494) (14,34-35; 11,3-16; evidentemente tradicional: «conservan las tradiciones como las he transmitido»), «*Confesiones*» (pp. 494-495) (8,6; 15,3-7; otro texto evidentemente tradicional: «transmití... lo que recibí») e incluso propone como tradiciones 15,51 y el cap. 13 (p. 502, n. 124). Como se ve, exceptuando 14,34-35 (texto que preferimos considerar interpolado no paulino)⁽⁵³⁾ y las citas encuadradas en los caps. 8-10 (en los que ya señalamos posibles reelaboraciones, y sobre las que volveremos; además de la posibilidad de que 8,6 sea una cita de «slogan» corintio), los textos que considera elementos provenientes de la tradición, se encuentran en las perícopas que hemos considerado interpoladas por el mismo Pablo en un segundo momento. Pablo considera importante remitir a los corintios, que vuelven atrás en su fe («niños»), que vuelven al antiguo eón (según el mundo) olvidando la novedad del espíritu, a volver a los orígenes de su fe para mantenerse fieles a lo que han recibido⁽⁵⁴⁾.

(52) El tema es muy complejo, y las posiciones son muy diversas; desde la visión cuasi-panteísta de la Religionsgeschichte (Reitzenstein, Weiß) al Cristo místico de Allo, Prat y otros; desde la influencia gnóstica del mito del «anthropos» de Käsemann y Neuenzeit al Cristo estrictamente individual de Cerfaux y Havet. Lo último que hemos visto sobre el tema es la obra colectiva citada en nota 47.

(53) Cf. nota 25. Además de E. Schüssler Fiorenza (cf. nota 26), se oponen a considerar interpolado el texto, E. E. ELLIS, «The Silenced Wives of Corinth (1 Cor 14,34-5)», *New Testament Textual Criticism: Its Significance for Exegesis* (ed. E. J. EPP-G. D. FEE) (Oxford 1981) 213-220; id., «Traditions in 1 Cor», 492-493 y BARTON, «Paul's Sense of Place», 229-234.

(54) Cf. W. WILLIS, «The 'Mind of Christ' in 1 Corinthians 2,16», *Bib 70* (1989) 110-122. Creemos que subyace en esto la «nueva concepción de la historia de la salvación» que conlleva «un modo objetivo de existencia en el que el cristiano se encuentra a sí mismo por medio de la fe»; J. A. FITZMYER, «Teología de san Pablo», *Comentario Bíblico «san Jerónimo»*

3. El criterio del término *perì de*, sirve para delimitar la primitiva carta de respuesta. Su fuente es un escrito remitido por los corintios que llegó a manos de Pablo (según algunas opiniones, llevado por Estéfanos)⁽⁵⁵⁾; pero por otras fuentes (los de Cloe) recibe información oral: 1,11; «solo se oye (*akouetai*) hablar de inmoralidad entre ustedes», 5,1; «ante todo, oigo (*akouô*) que al reunirse en asamblea hay divisiones entre ustedes», 11,18. La fuente de información oral, entonces, también es un criterio estructurante (más difícil de detectar) de un segundo momento literario de la 1 Corintios.

Sugerimos que Pablo, en su primera edición de la carta, frente a la situación y los planteos corintios, busca equilibrar, ordenar, «editar» (8,1.10; 10,23; 14,4.17). Sin embargo, la crisis corintia le exige ir más a la raíz del problema. Así, buscará llevar a la comunidad al origen de su propia fe mirando la tradición, y buscará llevar a la comunidad al corazón mismo de la fe: *el amor* (cf. Ga 5,6). La misma respuesta que ya había preparado le sirve de punto de partida para la re-edición de la carta; para ello recurre a aquel *perì de* en el que se detectaba una división subyacente en la comunidad: *perì de tôn eidô-lothytôn*, y aplica el mismo criterio: *hê dê agápê oikodomei* (8,1).

Creemos que los elementos interpolados por el mismo Pablo, son de hecho «pastorales» (la unidad y la sabiduría de la cruz, 1-4; elementos morales, 5-6; actitudes frente a las celebraciones, 11,2-34; la actitud fundamental frente a todo, 13; la actitud frente a la resurrección,

(ed. R. E. BROWN—J. A. FITZMYER—R. E. MURPHY) (Madrid 1972) V, 771 y 788; «Pablo, siempre que se pone a hablar de la nueva existencia del cristiano, casi siempre empieza hablando del 'Espíritu'»: G. EICHHOLZ, *El Evangelio de Pablo*. Esbozo de teología paulina (Salamanca 1977) 379.

⁽⁵⁵⁾ Así, por ejemplo, la nota de la Biblia de Jerusalén; es probable. Pero también es posible que Estéfanos estuviera cierto tiempo con el Apóstol y la carta le llegara por otros medios; de hecho se habla de que, con sus acompañantes, «han tranquilizado mi espíritu» (16,18); algo que puede significar una presencia y estadía no muy breve si tenemos en cuenta que, aunque nada nos diga Lucas en Hechos, la estadía de Pablo en Efeso, desde donde escribe (16,8) parece incluir numerosas dificultades (¿prisión? cfr. Flp, si es de esta época), así 1 Cor 15,32. Si Estéfanos está con Pablo desde hace tiempo («han tranquilizado mi espíritu», 16,18), se comprende mejor que la situación se haya agravado críticamente, sin que Estéfanos lo sepa (de allí las interpolaciones) y que Pablo lo recomiende, haciendo suya las perspectivas de «los de Cloe». Así, entre uno y otro, no habría «contradicción».

15), pero no dejan de ser «pastorales» las respuestas *peri de* el matrimonio y la virginidad, la carne inmolada a los ídolos, la situación de los pneumáticos, la colecta... Sin embargo, mientras estos elementos buscan indicar el «lugar» adecuado de cada uno, los anteriores buscan, preferentemente, señalar el amor como criterio de unidad. Nos parece que un pequeño cambio de matiz y enfoque caracteriza la «segunda redacción» de la 1 Cor. En este sentido, no creemos improbable que 9,1-10,22 sea incorporado en esta segunda etapa, y quizá también lo sean 10,23 y 11,1⁽⁵⁶⁾.

En este sentido cobra mayor importancia el tema del «espíritu» entendido como don escatológico esperado por los judíos al final de los tiempos. Los corintios han retrocedido en su vida, actúan como carnales (*hôs sarkinois*) (3,1), parecen no haber recibido el don de Dios, ya que actúan como de este eón, «de este mundo» (otro término particularmente importante en esta parte; cf. 2,12). El tema está presente en la «primera edición» (caps. 12 y 14), pero lo encontramos acentuado en la «segunda edición», donde adquiere mayor importancia como «modo de vida» (según el espíritu) y como don; es así que les recalca (3,16-17; 6,19; 2 Cor 6,16) que son «Templo» donde habita el Espíritu. Precisamente, la idea de «Templo» está, como acertadamente señala J. Coppens, en estrecha relación a la unidad frente a los grupos astillados (*splinter*)⁽⁵⁷⁾, ya que el mismo Espíritu es principio de unidad. Así, el cristiano tiene la responsabilidad de «edificar» la Iglesia (3,9-17)⁽⁵⁸⁾.

(56) Cf. R.A. HORSLEY, «Gnosis in Corinth: 1 Corinthians 8,1-6», *NTS* 27 (1981) 32-51; BRUNT, «Rejected, Ignored or Misunderstood»; P.W. GOOCH, «'Conscience' in 1 Corinthians 8 and 10», *NTS* 33 (1987) 244-254; R. SCHNACKENBURG, *Die sittliche Botschaft des Neuen Testament*, (HTKNT Supp./II; Freiburg-Basel-Wien 1988) 48-58 (espec. 51-56). No creemos que esto contradiga lo que hemos afirmado en «¿'ver- juzgar- actuar' en San Pablo?» ya que hablamos del «resultado final» no del proceso de composición. No hacemos aquí referencia a 9,19-22 que, por su evidente estructura quiástica, puede ser anterior (¿parte de la primera edición? ¿slogan del mismo Pablo?).

(57) J. COPPENS, «The Spiritual Temple in the Pauline Letters and its Background» (SE VI-TU 112; Berlin 1973) 56.

(58) Cfr. FITZMYER, «Teología de San Pablo», 828; cf. H. SCHLIER, «Eclesiología del Nuevo Testamento», *Mysterium Salutis* IV/1 (Madrid 1973) 170. Es interesante notar, al respecto, que en la nueva edición de su «Pauline Theology» (*The New Jerome Biblical Commentary*, 1411-1412), FITZMYER, que colocaba antes la «elesiología paulina» en un apartado («Eclesiología y ética paulinas») la ubica ahora en la «Antropología».

No hay que descuidar, asimismo, la referencia a lo «espiritual», que encontramos en 12,1 y 14,1 (y v. 37), pero con el acento puesto en los dones. El tema cobra mayor importancia en 1-4; 9,11; 10,3-4; 15,44b-46. Es un tema importante en la carta⁽⁵⁹⁾, y tiene una cierta relación con lo sacramental⁽⁶⁰⁾. Precisamente lo sacramental tenía una única referencia en 12,13 donde Pablo alude al Bautismo, y según algunos a la Eucaristía⁽⁶¹⁾, cobra una importancia mucho mayor en la «segunda edición»: en cap. 1 (Bautismo) y 10 y 11 (Eucaristía). Los sacramentos deben llevarlos a una nueva vida: antes llevaban un modo de vida que les impedía heredar el Reino de Dios, pero «han sido lavados, han sido santificados, han sido justificados en el nombre del Señor Jesucristo y en el Espíritu de nuestro Dios» (6,11). Una vez más, creemos, Pablo toma un elemento insinuado en la primera redacción y lo amplía notablemente en la segunda, buscando siempre llevar a los corintios a los orígenes de la evangelización.

Precisamente, para referirse a los orígenes, la referencia al Evangelio y la evangelización es un tema importante en esta reedición de la carta: Pablo fue a Corinto a evangelizar (1,17), y engendró una comunidad (4,15) con una predicación fiel a la tradición (15,1). Es probable que los adversarios (a quienes no pretendemos intentar identificar aquí), hayan hecho referencia a la Tradición, y eso motive la polémica y la auto-defensa de Pablo en el cap. 9 centrada en el tema del Evangelio (9,12.14.16.18.23). El tema vuelve a ser importante en 2 Cor (2,12; 4,3.4; 8,18; 9,13; 10,14.16; 11,4.7).

4. Como hemos visto, algunos sostienen que los caps. 1-4 forman una *apología*⁽⁶²⁾. No es este el lugar de discutir la cuestión, pe-

⁽⁵⁹⁾ En Rom (3 veces), 1 Cor (14), Ga (1), Ef (3), Col (2), 1 Pe (2).

⁽⁶⁰⁾ PAINTER, «Paul and the 'Pneumatikoi'», 245.

⁽⁶¹⁾ Así GOPPELT, «Potizô», *TDNT* VI, 147, n. 18 y 160; A. FEUILLET, *Le Christ Sagesse de Dieu d'après les épîtres pauliniennes* (EB; Paris 1966) 101-102. De la misma opinión parece L. CERFAUX, *El Cristiano en San Pablo* (Bilbao 1965) 125, n. 77. Cf. E. WALTER, *Primera carta a los Corintios* (el Nuevo Testamento y su Mensaje 7; Barcelona 1977) 231. G. E. LADD, *A Theology of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids 1975) 541-543, distingue entre bautismo de agua y bautismo del espíritu, y cita 12,13 como probatorio.

⁽⁶²⁾ Así N. A. Dahl, J. Bradley Chance, E. Schüssler Fiorenza, (cf. nota 44), creemos que esto es posible si no se entiende que Pablo defiende «su partido» (cf. nota 45); cf. LIM, «Not in persuasive words», 137-149. Según

ro no podemos negar una estrecha relación entre algunas de las partes que hemos considerado interpoladas y la sección evidentemente apologética de 2 Cor 10-13⁽⁶³⁾: el hecho de que exista un «partido de Pablo» indica, como Barrett lo ha señalado, que había oposición al Apóstol⁽⁶⁴⁾; en el cap. 9 Pablo vuelve a defenderse, sin motivo aparente, de desconocidos, y defiende, como hemos visto, su Evangelio (cf. 2 Cor 10,16). Si, como hemos supuesto, los caps. 1-4 y 9 son agregados en un segundo momento, eso los hace más cercanos a 2 Cor 10-13, texto evidentemente apologético, y —según lo más probable— una unidad cercana en el tiempo a 1 Cor (y ciertamente, más a una «segunda redacción») en la fluida correspondencia entre Pablo y la comunidad corintia⁽⁶⁵⁾. Hay, de hecho, estrechas relaciones literarias entre 2 Cor y varias de las perícopas que hemos considerado interpoladas: la referencia a la «evangelización», a la debilidad (*astheneia*), a la «glorificación» (*kauchêsis*), a la posesión del Espíritu (cf. 2,11-16 y 2 Cor 10,12-18), y la cita (¿de Jer?) «el que se glorie, gloriase en el Señor» (1,31 y 2 Cor 10,17)⁽⁶⁶⁾. La actitud de gloriarse, si no es «gloriarse en el Señor», tiene en lo concreto una estrecha relación con la idolatría, en su sentido más profundo: poner la confianza en algo fuera de Dios⁽⁶⁷⁾ (en este caso, en uno mismo,

G.D. FEE, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (NICNT; Grand Rapids 1987) 4-10 (cf. 194-195 etc.). La difícil relación entre Pablo y los corintios la estudia V. HASLER, «Das Evangelium des Paulus in Korinth. Erwägungen zur Hermeneutik», *NTS* 30 (1983-1984) 109-129, aunque no coincidimos con algunos de sus puntos de vista.

⁽⁶³⁾ Cf. S. HAFEMANN, «'Self-Commendation' and Apostolic Legitimacy in 2 Corinthians: a Pauline Dialectic?», *NTS* 36 (1990) 66-88.

⁽⁶⁴⁾ BARRETT, *1 Cor*, 60. Es frecuente que Pablo haga una apología de sí mismo para defender el contenido de su Evangelio.

⁽⁶⁵⁾ Incluso ROLLAND, «La structure littéraire», 83-84, que considera 2 Cor 1-9 una unidad literaria (no es este lugar para discutir esta postura), y los tiene como «Dernière lettre écrite aux Corinthiens, depuis la Macédoine» ve los caps. 10-13 como la «Avant-dernière lettre écrite aux Corinthiens, depuis Ephèse» (con preámbulo perdido), con lo que la ubica más cerca en el tiempo a 1 Cor.

⁽⁶⁶⁾ Cf. J. SCHREINER, «Jeremia 9,22-23 als Hintergrund des paulinischen 'Sich-Rühmens'», *Neues Testament und Kirche*, für R. Schnackenburg (ed. J. GNILKA) (Freiburg 1974) 530-542.

⁽⁶⁷⁾ Cf. E. DE LA SERNA, «La iniciativa divina en 1 Cor», *RevistB* 51 (1989) 39-44 (de hecho es la última parte y conclusión de un trabajo no publicado sobre la sabiduría en 1 Cor 1-4; al mismo pertenece «La cruz y el crucificado en 1 Cor», *RevistB* 49 [1987] 209-213).

en sus capacidades), así volvemos a encontrar referencias a la idolatría en 10,1-22; «el parentesco entre *kauchêsis* y *pepoithêsis* [confiar] se pone de manifiesto también comparando 2 Co 1,12 y 3,4; se desprende también del cambio de *pepoithêsis*, *pepoithênai* y *kauchasthai* en 2 Co 10,2.7s»⁽⁶⁸⁾.

El clima no polémico de la carta de respuesta (*Antwortbrief*), se enraíza en su «segunda edición» (cercana en el tiempo a la siguiente carta polémica, que conservamos recopilada en 2 Cor [los caps. 10-13]); la situación parece suavizarse más adelante, como puede verse en otras partes de 2 Cor. La cercanía entre ciertas partes de 1 Cor, las que hemos considerado interpoladas, y 2 Cor 10-13 ha llevado a algunos a considerarlas una unidad en una carta primitiva (así, J. Harrison)⁽⁶⁹⁾. Sin embargo, en 2 Cor 10-13 la situación parece haberse agravado aún más, y ser de mayor enfrentamiento. Si consideramos interpolados los capítulos señalados, se explica —creemos— más fácilmente el paso de una situación aparentemente pacífica a una más polémica (como se ve, por ejemplo, entre cap. 8 y cap. 9) sin necesidad de recurrir a rupturas, las cuales presentan los riesgos que hemos señalado.

5. Además de lo indicado, habría que dar respuesta a la *aparente contradicción* sobre el tema de la carne inmolada a los ídolos que se detecta entre cap. 8 y cap. 10. Sobre esto, la incorporación posterior de 9,1-10,22 puede aportar algún elemento. De todas maneras, la contradicción no parece tan marcada como aparenta: el análisis de la situación debe tener en cuenta que 8,4 tiene apariencia de ser un «slogan» corintio, y tiene una cierta corrección en 8,5; además, es evidente que no existen los ídolos —en cuanto divinidades—, pero no es menos evidente que existe la idolatría⁽⁷⁰⁾. Por otra parte, como acertadamente señala Horsley, bien pueden subyacer detrás de esta aparente contradicción, diferentes actitudes frente a la idolatría en el judaísmo⁽⁷¹⁾.

⁽⁶⁸⁾ BULTMANN, *Teología*, 297, n. 10; cfr. id., *kauchomai*, *TDNT* III, 645-654; H. Ch. HAHN, «Gloriarse», *Diccionario Teológico del Nuevo Testamento*, II 234-236.

⁽⁶⁹⁾ Citado por KÜMMEL, *Introduction*, 276, n. 28.

⁽⁷⁰⁾ Experiencia dolorosa de cada día en nuestra América Latina.

⁽⁷¹⁾ HORSLEY, «Gnosis in Corinth», 48-51, propone que mientras los corintios (cerca del judaísmo helenista) tienen una actitud frente a la idolatría, Pablo (más cerca de la apocalíptica), tiene otros criterios. Semejante, BARRETT, *1 Cor*, 294-295 y HASLER, «Das Evangelium», 116. Sobre Pablo y la apocalíptica, cf. P. BENOIT, «L'évolution du langage apocalyptique

6. No podemos dejar de intentar una respuesta al interrogante de por qué interpola Pablo *en el lugar que interpola* los textos. Ciertamente, toda respuesta en este sentido, se mueve en lo evidentemente hipotético, y corremos el riesgo de indicar por qué nosotros lo agregaríamos donde de hecho está.

Creemos que la primera parte (caps. 1-4 y 5-6) está colocada en este lugar debido a que frente a la nueva situación (ruptura de la unidad), antes de contestar la carta, Pablo quiere ir a los problemas más vitales. En la comunidad, «todavía son carnales» (3,3). Pablo quiere llevarlos a superar las discordias (caps. 1-4) para que no se alimenten como niños sino como maduros «en Cristo» (3,1-4), y que no vuelvan a modos de vida que debían haber quedado atrás (caps. 5-6). El cap. 15, la resurrección, quiere ponerlo al final para que quede muy clara su importancia (sin ella, «vacía es nuestra predicación, vacía es nuestra fe», «somos los más dignos de compasión de todos los hombres» vv. 14.19 ya que sin fidelidad a la tradición «habrían creído en vano» v. 2). El cap. 11 está ubicado en el final de las cuestiones de asamblea (idolotitos) y antes de una nueva cuestión de asamblea (espirituales). Las divisiones de la asamblea, lógicamente deben colocarse en medio de otras cuestiones de asamblea. El cap. 13, pretende no prestar tanto la atención a una «escala de valores» (caps. 12 y 14) cuanto a un criterio superador de todas las divisiones: el amor; sólo después de esto tiene sentido cualquier «escala de valores» (cf. el simil del cuerpo).

Nadie discutiría hoy que la Primera carta a los Corintios es una «carta viva». Esa vida interior ha sido, frecuentemente, esgrimida como la razón última de la falta de una lógica evidente (de una estructura). Si lo que aquí hemos sostenido es correcto, y se puede concluir una segunda etapa redaccional en la carta, esto haría más difícil aún poder detectar su lógica interna. Es posible que Pablo contestara (*perì de*) la carta de los corintios «punto por punto», y tal sería la lógica interna de la primera edición. No es fácil, en cambio, concluir por qué incorpora en el lugar que lo hace lo que hemos llamado «segunda edición». Creemos, en suma, que partiendo del esquema de la «primera redacción» y agregando elementos que la

dans le corpus paulinien», *Apocalypses et Théologies de l'Espérance* (LD 95; Paris 1977) 299-335; J.M. COURT, «Paul and the Apocalyptic Pattern», *Paul and Paulinism. Essays in honour of C.K. Barrett* (eds. M.D. HOOKER-S.G. WILSON) (London 1982) 57-66.

situación, la urgencia o lo que Pablo descubre como causa y raíz principal de los agravados problemas corintios (lugar «patriarcal» del amor, lugar importante de la evangelización, conciencia profunda de la radicalidad y novedad del nuevo eón comenzado en Cristo) llegamos a nuestra actual redacción de 1 Corintios; carta que por su génesis y por su historia viva, no permite descubrir una lógica interna evidente y, menos aún, concluyente.

7. Finalmente, quedaría por responder el interrogante de si es posible que Pablo haga él mismo interpolaciones. Frecuentemente se ha hablado de un «*Ur-Markus*» (Pesch), de diferentes etapas redaccionales en Mt (Fuchs, Trilling), de un Proto-Lc (al menos, de una incorporación tardía de los caps. 1-2: Brown, Fitzmyer), de etapas de redacción en Jn (Brown, Schnackenburg, Boismard, Gnllka, Léon-Dufour), del Apocalipsis (Boismard, Läpple), las cartas «Pastorales» (Gogel, Spicq, Dornier-Carrez) y las —ya referidas— propuestas de interpolaciones en las cartas paulinas y 1 Pe (Munro). Muchas de estas posturas han recibido críticas; sin embargo, quizá la más aceptada es la de diferentes etapas redaccionales del Cuarto Evangelio: «es razonable pensar que Juan no ha redactado su obra en una sólo tirada. Probablemente la ha revisado y la ha aumentado considerablemente en vistas a una segunda edición»⁽⁷²⁾. Creemos, análogamente, que es perfectamente posible suponer que el mismo Pablo reelabora la carta a la luz de «nuevas» situaciones⁽⁷³⁾ (sean nuevas de hecho, o sean nuevos los puntos de vista). De hecho, cuando E. E. Ellis propone la incorporación de tradiciones a la carta, sugiere (refiriéndose a 11,3-16) que fue insertada después de haber sido escrita, y antes de haber sido enviada⁽⁷⁴⁾.

A veces se ha recurrido a la falta de testimonios textuales para cuestionar propuestas semejantes a las que aquí hacemos; sin embargo, creemos que no ha de exigirse demasiado a estos testimonios. Por otra parte, no creemos probable que los haya; de hecho, proponemos que Pablo reeditó la 1 Cor, antes de haberla enviado, por lo cual no podría haber pruebas textuales de la «carta primitiva»; sólo

(72) B. Lindars, en B. RIGAUX - B. LINDARS, *Para una historia de Jesús. V: El testimonio del Evangelio de Juan* (Bilbao 1979) 85.

(73) «...supone la introducción de nuevos materiales aptos para resolver nuevos problemas»: BROWN, *El Evangelio de Juan*, 39.

(74) ELLIS, «Traditions in 1 Cor», 493.

quedarían pruebas literarias. Es lo que aquí nos hemos propuesto encontrar.

Es posible que muchos planteos sigan sin respuesta. Sin embargo, creemos que lo propuesto en este trabajo, es plenamente coherente con los datos y la «falta de coherencia» que la Carta presenta; y nos parece que se aleja prudentemente del riesgo de «subjetividad» de construir nuestra propia carta a los corintios. No dudamos, de todos modos, que la cuestión seguirá abierta.

Centro de Estudios Filosóficos
y Teológicos de Quilmes
C. Pellegrini 1650
1879 Quilmes Argentina

Eduardo DE LA SERNA

SUMMARY

After analyzing various proposals concerning the composition of 1 Cor (a mosaic of letters, unity, interpolations), it is suggested that Paul wrote to the Corinthians in order to respond to questions presented to him in writing (7,1). Each question is introduced by the expression *peri de* (7,1.25; 8,1; 12,1; 16,1.12). Meanwhile, the Apostle discovered through oral information that the situation had worsened. This motivates him to include, in a "second edition", a series of pericopes concerning unity and love (1-6; [9,1-10,22]; [10,23; 11,1]; 11,2-34; 12,31b-14,1a; 15; 16,13-24). This would explain the unity of the letter and, at the same time, its lack of internal uniformity.

Transgressor by Nullifying God's Grace. A Study of Gal 2,18-21

The main question of this study concerns the term *παραβάτης* of Gal 2,18: "But if I build up again those things which I tore down, then I prove myself a transgressor". The first person singular in this verse points (at least rhetorically) to Paul. Why is Paul proving or constituting himself a transgressor, if what he has pulled down he builds up again? Was the past pulling-down itself a transgression or is the actual building-up a transgression⁽¹⁾? The *παραβάτης-παράβασις* vocabulary in Paul strongly suggests the meaning 'transgressing the Law'. Is this so, more specifically in v. 18b? Of course, apart from the context of this verse no answer to our main question will be possible. But as soon as verses 14b-17 and 19-21 are brought into our investigation, a plethora of other problems arises.

At the outset of this investigation we may, once again⁽²⁾, propose the way we structure the pericope by means of a basically twofold division. After the introductory question (v. 14b)⁽³⁾, the first section, vv. 15-17 ('we'), offers a profound reflection. These verses provide the ultimate basis of Paul's conviction; for a moment they overlook, as it were, the incident reported in vv. 10-14a. In the second section, vv. 18-21 ('I'), Paul then returns to the concrete

(1) Cf. W. GROSSOUW, *De brief van Paulus aan de Galaten* (Het N. T.; Bussum 1974) 107-108: "How one must precisely understand the last clause (v. 18b) is difficult to establish with certainty, also with regard to the meaning of the verb" (107).

(2) See J. LAMBRECHT, "The Line of Thought in Gal. 2. 14b-21", *NTS* 24 (1977-78) 484-495 and "Once Again Gal 2,17-18 and 3,21", *ETL* 63 (1987) 148-153.

(3) In his recent study "Paulus und Petrus in Antiochien. Zum Verständnis von Galater 2. 11-21", *NTS* 37 (1991) 77-100, esp. 80-81, P. C. BÖTTGER strangely maintains that living "as a Gentile" (*ἔθνικῶς*) consists not so much in Peter's previous eating with the Gentiles as, more fundamentally and paradoxically, in the act of separating himself from that table fellowship and so returning to a Jewish state without salvation, not different from that of the Gentiles.

difficulty in Antioch and begins a new train of thought. In this study we limit ourselves to the second section, vv. 18-21. However, three results — still valid, we hope — from our former examination of vv. 14b-18 must be given since they are required for the further analysis.

I. Options

First, sinner and sin in vv. 15 and 17 have the same radical sense (not just the transgression of a ceremonial Law). In v. 15 Paul opens with a concession to the common Jewish opinion and pride: Jews are better than Gentiles; by birth they are not Gentile sinners. But, he continues in v. 16, that is not the whole story. We Jews who became believers realized that nobody can be justified through the works of the Law. "If, in our endeavor to be justified in Christ, we ourselves were found to be sinners": this protasis of v. 17 is a 'realis'. The protasis expresses Paul's own innermost conviction: Jews as well as Gentiles are sinners (cf., e.g., 3,22 and Rom 3,23), in need of justification through Christ⁽⁴⁾.

Second, in v. 17 the Galatian opponents have concluded from Paul's theological position that Christ then is an agent of sin. We must understand this illegitimate conclusion according to the accusation present also in the letter to the Romans: the grace of Christ promotes sin; see 3,8; 6,1.15 and cf. Gal 5,13⁽⁵⁾.

⁽⁴⁾ Cf. recently H. MERKLEIN, "Die Bedeutung des Kreuzestodes Christi für die paulinische Gerechtigkeits- und Gesetzesthematik", *Studien zu Jesus und Paulus* (WUNT 43; Tübingen 1987) 1-105, esp. 44-45.

⁽⁵⁾ As for many others so also for F. NEITZEL, "Zur Interpretation von Galater 2,11-21", *TQ* 163 (1983) 15-39 and 131-149, esp. 30-39, by "sinners" in v. 17a Paul refers back to the sinful behaviour of Peter and others at Antioch: they sin through seeking again to be justified by the works of the Law: «... wird dann Christus diese Sünde gegen ihn selbst und gegen die Gnade Gottes (2,21) wie ein Diener unterstützen und gutheissen?» (37). This long study commends itself by its philological strength as well as by a broad discussion of early Christian writers. Several positions of Neitzel, however, are somewhat idiosyncratic, e.g., his reading of v. 15 which places a comma before ἁμαρτωλοί and thus links "sinners" with "we Jews" (so already C. Marius Victorinus, 4th cent.): "Wir, der Herkunft nach Juden und nicht aus den Heiden ..., Sünder mit der Einsicht, dass niemand..." (26). Cf. also A. SUHL, *Paulus und seine Briefe. Ein Beitrag zur paulinischen Chronologie* (SNT 11; Gütersloh 1975) 23-24; and, recently, V. JEGHER-BUCHER, "Formgeschichtliche Betrachtung zu Galater 2,11-16", *TZ* 46 (1990) 305-321. This last study sees 2,11-16 as a "chreia"

Third, we think that after v. 17 there is a kind of break, a caesura. The γάρ at the beginning of v. 18 comes close to meaning almost "but". After his reflection on what happened at the time of the justification Paul comes back to the concrete Antiochean incident which manifested Peter's behaviour of restoring what was pulled down. Of course, one could argue that between v. 17 and v. 18 something is missing, that in his emotion Paul has omitted the necessary logical link. So one may conjecture that Paul, after v. 17 and before writing v. 18, thought: "Not Christ is an agent of sin, *but* we may become promoters of sin, *for* if I build up again..."⁽⁶⁾. This hypothetical intervening thought fulfils more or less the same logical function as our hypothetically slightly adversative γάρ which introduces a new idea.

II. A First Reading

Verses 18-20

The break between v. 17 and v. 18 is evident from the time references (in v. 17: conversion; in v. 18: Antiochean incident and now), and also from the sudden appearance of "I". Already in vv. 15-17 Paul, out of rhetorical skill as well as tactful concern, has associated himself with Peter. Peter must also be aimed at in v. 18; yet, Paul equally reflects on what would be the consequences of his own eventual action. "But if I build up again those things which I tore down, then I prove myself a transgressor". Notwithstanding the caesura ("but") the term "transgressor" is somewhat related to "sinners" and "sin" in the preceding verse 17.

in which verses 15-16 contain Peter's answer to Paul's question of v. 14b. In v. 15 Peter recognizes that eating with the Gentiles is a sin against the agreement reached in Jerusalem (cf. 2,1-10). Jegher-Bucher even proposes to read at the beginning of v. 15 φησι instead of φουσι.

⁽⁶⁾ E. D. BURTON, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians* (ICC; Edinburgh 1921 [= 1962]) 130-132: "The reasoning of this sentence is of the type *e contrario*. So far from its being the case that I commit sin by violating statutes of the law, it is, on the contrary, the fact that if I build up again those commands of the law which I broke down, I show myself therein a transgressor" (130). Cf. v. 18 in the Revised English Bible, which strangely translates εὑρέθημεν in v. 17 by the present "we turn out to be": "On the contrary, it is only if I start building up again all I have pulled down that I prove to be one who breaks the law". Note how the paraphrase for "transgressor" at the end of v. 18b mentions the Law.

V.19ab motivates v.18, more specifically the idea of transgressing: we have a normal explanatory γάρ. Since through the Law Paul died to the Law, he transgresses by building up that Law. He should not work nor live any longer for the Law; he must live for Christ. Some elements of this statement remain for the moment mysterious. The general flow of thought, however, can hardly be doubted.

V.19c repeats and clarifies v.19a. The way Paul died was the death on the cross: he has been crucified with Christ. By this complementary information we now know where, when and how Paul died. The perfect tense points to an enduring state.

In the light of v.19c the long v.20 resumes and corrects v.19ab as well as combining it with v.19c; v.20 starts with an opposing δέ. As a matter of fact Paul's actual life is no longer his own life, but that of Christ. His present bodily life is lived in faith in the Son of God. Christ loved Paul personally and delivered himself for him.

The reader will note that up till now the train of thought which came to a stop at the end of v.18 is not further developed. What Paul adds in vv.19 and 20 is first motivation (v.19ab), then clarification (v.19c) and finally concretization of that motivation (v.20).

Verse 21

With its negative content v.21a probably takes up the idea of v.18a (here in the form of a protasis). "I do not nullify the grace of God" seems to paraphrase "I am not going to build up again these things which I tore down". If this reading is correct Paul would become a transgressor by nullifying God's grace, by building up again.

In v.21bc there is one more explanatory γάρ. A verb is missing in the protasis of this conditional period and, moreover, there is no ἄν in the apodosis. So one may wonder whether instead of an 'irrealis' (a condition contrary to fact) the grammatical form is not a 'realis', a condition of fact (a "simple condition"). The reasoning would then be: If A, then B; the form of a condition of fact is indifferent to the fulfilment or non-fulfilment of what is stated. What we have is no more than the stringent logical connection⁽⁷⁾. In v.21bc this gives literally: "if justification through

(7) See for further comment and bibliography J. LAMBRECHT, "Unreal Conditions in the Letters of Paul: A Clarification", *ETL* 63 (1987) 153-156.

Law, then Christ died in vain" (8). Thus, to the question "Why does Paul nullify God's grace?", the answer is: "Because, if justification is through the Law, then Christ died to no purpose". V.21b corresponds to v. 18a regarding its content: if the Law is in force (again); if it is built up again. V.21c draws the conclusion: then the death of Christ has been in vain. Verse 21bc explains why, in such case, Paul destroys the grace of God.

Two remarks

At the end of this first reading we may highlight two points already mentioned. Most exegetes opine that the "I" in vv.19-21 certainly means Paul himself (9). What about v.18? Although v.18 refers back to the Antiochean incident and, because of this, the "I" seems to include Peter, in no way can we minimize the reference to Paul. Just as in the case of v.21bc, the grammatical form of the conditional period of v.18 is a "simple condition". As we saw, the content of v.18 is not so different from that in v.21. Paul, who died to the Law and has been crucified with Christ (v.19), makes the double supposition: if I build up again those things I tore down (v.18a), if there is justification through the Law (v.21b). In v.18 Paul no doubt uses "I" also in order not to offend Peter, but the

(8) The translation of v.21bc taken as an unreal condition should be: "If justification *were* through the Law, then Christ *would have died* in vain". The *RSV* translates the protasis as an unreal one (*were*), but supplies a simple past in the apodosis. The *NRSV* has a real condition: "If justification comes through the law, then Christ died for nothing" (real also in the *NJB*).

(9) S. ZEDDA, "'Morto alla legge mediante la legge' (Gal 2,19a): testo autobiografico sulla conversione di san Paolo?", *RivB* 37 (1989) 81-95, speaks of an "I" "autobiografico personale tipico" (81): Paul does not exclude the other Christians. Cf. R. KIEFFER, *Foi et justification à Antioche. Interprétation d'un conflit (Ga 2,14-21)* (LD 111; Paris 1982) 67: "Paul prend ce 'je' à son propre compte. Il ne s'agit plus désormais d'une identification rhétorique avec Pierre et les judéo-chrétiens qui, ayant la même origine juive que lui, sont tentés de réédifier le système de la Loi. Au contraire, Paul développe cette fois-ci son expérience personnelle... Le 'je' paulinien devient ici le prototype de toute conversion authentique d'un Juif au Christ". B. LATEGAN, "Is Paul Defending his Apostleship in Galatians? The Function of Galatians 1.11-12 and 2.19-20 in the Development of Paul's Argument", *NTS* 34 (1988) 411-430, is less correct where he states that after v.18 "a transition from the personal 'I' to a universal 'I' has taken place" (427).

“I” in v. 18 and v. 21a must be basically consistent and referring in the first place to Paul (both as person and as a type to all Christians).

The second remark concerns Paul’s way of reasoning. Within vv. 18-21, the train of thought comes to a standstill, as it were, after v. 18 and is then resumed in v. 21. Vv. 19-20 motivate, explain and concretize. In v. 21a Paul denies the idea to which the hypothetical content of v. 18a leads, namely, that he is going to destroy the grace of God. Does v. 18b, therefore, not also contain that idea? V. 21bc explains the statement of v. 21a; as in v. 18 we have a conditional period. Grammatically speaking v. 21b corresponds with v. 18a, and v. 21c with v. 18b. What about their content?

Structured text of vv. 18-21

At the end of our first reading we may present the text of vv. 18-21 according to this line of thought:

- | | |
|-----|---|
| 18a | εἰ γὰρ ἂν κατέλυσα ταῦτα πάλιν οἰκοδομῶ, |
| b | παραβάτην ἑμαυτὸν συνιστάνω. |
| 19a | ἐγὼ γὰρ διὰ νόμου νόμῳ ἀπέθανον, |
| b | ἵνα θεῷ ζήσω. |
| c | Χριστῷ συνεσταύρωμαι. |
| 20a | ζῶ δὲ οὐκέτι ἐγώ, |
| b | ζῇ δὲ ἐν ἐμοὶ Χριστός. |
| c | ὁ δὲ νῦν ζῶ ἐν σαρκί, |
| d | ἐν πίστει ζῶ τῇ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ
τοῦ ἀγαπήσαντός με
καὶ παραδόντος ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ. |
| 21a | Οὐκ ἄθετῶ τὴν χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ. |
| b | εἰ γὰρ διὰ νόμου δικαιοσύνη, |
| c | ἄρα Χριστὸς δωρεὰν ἀπέθανεν. |

III. Further Analysis

Our first reading connects v. 18 with v. 21. It sees vv. 19-20 as a clarification of v. 18. Yet it is still not evident in what sense Paul calls himself a transgressor. A further analysis is needed. We proceed verse by verse.

Verse 18

The conditional sentence of v. 18 is a ‘realis’, a condition of fact. In the protasis we have the opposition between καταλύω and

οικοδομέω. Paul often uses antitheses⁽¹⁰⁾. At first sight it does not make much difference if συνιστάνω ἑμαυτὸν in the apodosis has the somewhat weaker sense "I show, I demonstrate, I prove myself" or the stronger one "I establish, I constitute myself". Pauline passages such as 2 Cor 7,11; Rom 3,5 and 5,8, however, seem to point to the weaker sense: Paul proves himself to be a transgressor⁽¹¹⁾. What does this mean?

The noun παραβάτης is not followed by an objective genitive, the presence of which would have indicated what Paul is actually transgressing. We shall have to look at the context to find out what is the implied direct object of "transgressing".

The aorist tense of κατέλυσα contains a reference to the time when Paul became a Christian. The adverb πάλιν and the verb οικοδομῶ point the reader to the hypothetical step of Paul (and the actual step of Peter) "to live again like a Jew" (cf. 2,14). With ἃ and ταῦτα we must think in the first place of eating with the Gentiles and, further, of calendar prescriptions (4,10), and circumcision (5,2-3). All this pertains to the Jewish Law. But it should be duly noted that νόμος itself is not mentioned in v.18a⁽¹²⁾. If that had been the case one would have been brought, almost inevitably, to understand the ensuing παραβάτης in v.18b as "transgressor of the Law".

Many interpreters, however, do mentally supply 'of the Law' after 'transgressor'. How does Paul then show himself a transgressor of the Law? There are two possibilities: either his previous pulling down of the Law was a transgression of the Law, or Paul, after having built up, will out of necessity sin in the future by not keeping all its commandments (see 3,10 and cf. 5,3). Because of the absence of νόμος in v.18 and even more because of the line of thought in vv.19-21 we hesitate to accept either of these interpretations.

⁽¹⁰⁾ Cf. G. BERENYI, "Gal 2,20: a Pre-Pauline or a Pauline Text?", *Bib* 65 (1984) 490-537, esp. 526-529.

⁽¹¹⁾ Cf. M.-J. LAGRANGE, *Épître aux Galates* (Paris 1918) 50. Paul seems to indicate a preference for the verb συνιστάνω: 13x (out of 16x in the NT). But he often uses it, especially in 2 Cor, in the sense of "to commend a person". The Vulgate translates in Gal 2,18: "praevaricatorem me constituo"; cf., e.g., KIEFFER, *Foi*, 60-66: "je me constitue".

⁽¹²⁾ A detail rightly stressed by NEITZEL, "Interpretation", 135-136.

Verse 19

The personal pronoun ἐγώ at the beginning of v. 19 is very emphatic⁽¹³⁾. In view of the fact that θεῶ in v. 19b is best understood as a dative of interest and because of the correspondence between the opposing verbs ἀπέθανον and ζήσω, the dative νόμῳ in v. 19a is probably a dative of disadvantage⁽¹⁴⁾: through the Law I died “to the Law” so that it has no longer any power over me. There is no qualification of either of the laws in v. 19a, but they must point to the same Jewish Law (cf. also vv. 16 and 21)⁽¹⁵⁾. The dative νόμῳ is preceded by the genitive expression διὰ τοῦ νόμου. What is its meaning?

In order to find a sense for the puzzling διὰ νόμου in v. 19a one must, it would seem, take a lead from v. 19c and, through it, from 3,13⁽¹⁶⁾. Why has Christ been crucified? According to 3,13 Christ became a curse, i. e., cursed by the Law, because he hung on the cross; and so he redeemed us from that same curse of the Law which we incurred through our sins. Paul appears here to be reasoning by means of categories such as reparatory substitution and atoning sacrifice. Christ died for us, on our behalf. Paul more specifically thinks in cultic terms of salvation through death. Christ has taken over the identity of us sinners; he died the death to which the Law had condemned us and so redeemed and blessed us (cf. 3,13-14)⁽¹⁷⁾.

(13) Cf. the pertinent comment on vv. 19-20 by GROSSOUW, *Galaten*, 108-110. He values this text as one of the great passages of world literature. It belongs to the “personal confession style”.

(14) The other opinion prefers datives of respect.

(15) Some interpreters see in διὰ νόμου another law, e. g., the law of Christ or the law of faith. Cf. LAGRANGE, *Galates*, 51: “Je suis... tenté de préférer l'explication très simple d'Ambrosiaster: ‘hoc dicit, quia per legem fidei mortuus est legi Moysis’...”.

(16) This is very much emphasized by Merklein in his study mentioned in n. 4.

(17) Cf. MERKLEIN, “Bedeutung”, 25: One must pay attention to the fact that in 2Cor 5,21 as well as in Gal 3,13 “Paulus den Stellvertretungsgedanken in einer eigentümlich spezifischen Weise artikuliert, indem er den (gerechten) Christus nicht nur die Schuld bzw. die Sünden der Sünder auf sich nehmen und an sich zur Auswirkung kommen lässt. Christus übernimmt vielmehr selbst die *Identität der Sünder*, indem er — als deren Repräsentant — zum ‘Fluch’, d. h. zum Verfluchten, wird bzw. (von Gott selbst!) zur ‘Sünde’ gemacht wird”.

According to 2,19a Paul dies. "Die Beifügung διὰ νόμου νόμῳ zeigt, dass beim 'Sterben' an den homo peccator gedacht ist, also an den Menschen, sofern er Sünder... ist (vgl. Gal 2,16f)"⁽¹⁸⁾. Through that identification of Paul-sinner and Christ who on the cross became a curse, Paul was present and dying the moment Jesus died on the cross⁽¹⁹⁾. This death by the Law was his redemption; it was at the same time a death *to* the Law. Through this death Paul is no longer ὑπὸ νόμον (cf. 4,21). Henceforth he must live for God (2,19b; cf. Rom 7,4.6).

Paul can even say in Gal 2,19c: I have been crucified with Christ. "This is a bold statement from one who was not even present at Calvary!"⁽²⁰⁾. But Paul was present; this is his firm conviction. There and then, Paul died to the Law. One realizes both the metaphorical and paradoxical qualities of the verb συσταυροῦμαι which is not found before Paul. It is quite possible that Paul created this metaphor. The paradoxical character of v. 19c should be duly reflected upon: nothing is common between death on a cross and new life; moreover, both death and life are conceived of as through and together with Christ⁽²¹⁾! The perfect tense συνεσταυρωμαι is not accidental: "das Mit-Christus-gekreuzigt-Sein (ist) die bleibende Existenz des Gerechtfertigten"⁽²²⁾.

For the whole of v. 19 we must refer to 2 Cor 5,14-15: "For the love of Christ controls us, because we are convinced that one has died for all; therefore all have died. And he died for all, that those who live might live no longer for themselves but for him who for their sake died and was raised".

⁽¹⁸⁾ Ibid, 49.

⁽¹⁹⁾ Many exegetes opine — rightly? — that Paul in 2,19 also thinks of baptism; they refer to Rom 6,1-11. See, e.g., KIEFFER, *Foi*, 52 and 69-70.

⁽²⁰⁾ BERENYI, "Gal 2,20", 527.

⁽²¹⁾ Cf. GROSSOUW, *Galaten*, 109-110: "We hebben hier naar alle waarschijnlijkheid te maken met het zeldzame verschijnsel van een werkelijk oorspronkelijke metafoor, en dit niet zozeer omdat het woord συσταυροῦν hier voor het eerst in de griekse literatuur voorkomt (dit kan puur toeval zijn), maar om de wijze waarop het hier, naar alle schijn, voor het eerst, *sine exemplo*, metaforisch gebruikt wordt" (110). Grossouw offers also a good description of the paradox.

⁽²²⁾ MERKLEIN, "Bedeutung", 50.

Verse 20

This is the longest verse of the passage⁽²³⁾, much discussed because of the christological content of v. 20d which is often thought to go back to a traditional *Dahingabeformel*. Paul continues to speak a paradoxical language: no longer his own life, Christ's life in him; Christ delivers himself up for Paul. There are, moreover, two sharp antitheses: in v. 20ab I-Christ, in v. 20cd flesh-faith. The excellent recent study of G. Berényi will prove very helpful. However, we only mention from it what is needed for our purpose⁽²⁴⁾.

The initial δέ in v. 20a corrects what Paul just said in v. 19b about his living for God. As a matter of fact (again a δέ in v. 20b, now opposing), it is Christ who lives in him. We note the change of subject. In v. 20a and b we have before us two short clauses of equal length, beginning respectively with ζῶ δέ and ζῆ δέ and ending antithetically — the second as it were excluding the first — with ἐγώ and Χριστός. Berényi comments: "a striking paradox in that an obviously alive man asserts that he is not living but that another person, Christ, is living in him"⁽²⁵⁾. We may refer to 1 Cor 15,10 for a similar affirmation and negation: "I worked harder than any of them, though it was not I, but the grace of God which is with me".

Yet in v. 20cd, by means of a third and opposing δέ⁽²⁶⁾ Paul must come back to the first person singular, to his own living "now". He cannot deny it completely. It is, moreover, a life in the flesh. This human life is still (vūv) bodily, creaturely fragile⁽²⁷⁾; it is not yet the eschatological existence. But already now that life in the flesh is simultaneously a life in the faith of the Son of God who loved Paul and delivered himself for him. The clause "what I now live" (v. 20c) is the direct object of the same verb of v. 20d: "(what I now live) I live ..." ⁽²⁸⁾. The relative pronoun ὃ may be limitative; it

⁽²³⁾ See the characterization of GROSSOUW, *Galaten*, 108: "In v. 20 duidelijk de wet van de 'aangroeiende zinsneden'".

⁽²⁴⁾ See "Gal 2,20", in n. 10, esp. 523-537.

⁽²⁵⁾ BERÉNYI, "Gal 2,20", 527.

⁽²⁶⁾ For the nuances of the threefold δέ in v. 20 see KIEFFER *Foi*, 71 and 74. Cf. LAGRANGE, *Galates*, 52.

⁽²⁷⁾ See, e.g., 2 Cor 10,3 for the difference between the neutral ἐν σαρκί and the negative κατὰ σάρκα: "For though we walk 'in the flesh' we do not war 'according to the flesh'".

⁽²⁸⁾ Regarding the discussion whether Paul means a mystical

then suggests, as it were, a lesser form of life: "So far as I live now in the flesh" ⁽²⁹⁾. "I live" is qualified not only by "now" (over against the eschatological future) but also by "in the flesh" (over against a life which will be spiritual, heavenly, immortal and incorruptible — see 1 Cor 15,48-54).

In v.20d υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ ⁽³⁰⁾ is an objective genitive just as Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ in v.16, which genitive is immediately explained in the same verse 16 by "even we have believed in Christ". Berényi has shown that v.20d is not a stereotyped and traditional formula. Both wording and content come from Paul. V.20d is a Pauline creation. A comparison with the undoubtedly traditional formula in 1 Cor 15,3 Χριστός (traditional?) ἀπέθανεν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀπαρτιῶν ἡμῶν might prove instructive.

Three Pauline particularities *vis-à-vis* 1 Cor 15,3 must be stressed. (1) Instead of Χριστός we have in v.20d υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ. The title "Son of God" is "rarely used by Paul. With its solemnity this title underlines the contrast with 'me' and therefore contributes to the paradoxical character of the verse" ⁽³¹⁾. (2) Παραδίδωμι is different from δίδωμι. Παραδίδωμι with personal object (here reflexive pronoun) possesses a negative meaning; it "implies that the person is delivering himself up to a hostile treatment" ⁽³²⁾. Moreover, "...the expression... with παραδίδωμι and the reflexive pronoun is a création of Paul himself" ⁽³³⁾. (3) The typical and original use of ἀγαπάω by Paul is confirmed by passages such as Rom 5,6-8 and 8,32-39 which both possess a similar context. This verb "provides the motivation of and accounts for the efficacy of

(sacramental) life or just a life in faith or both, cf. the treatment in KIEFFER, *Foi*, 72-74.

⁽²⁹⁾ J.B. LIGHTFOOT, *Saint Paul's Epistle to the Galatians* (London 1881) 119. Cf. MERKLEIN, "Bedeutung", 50: "Sofern er aber — de facto — doch noch 'im Fleische' lebt..."

⁽³⁰⁾ For a discussion of the variant θεοῦ καὶ Χριστοῦ, see B.M. METZGER, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (London-New York 1971) 593.

⁽³¹⁾ BERENYI, "Gal 2,20", 536. Cf. KIEFFER, *Foi*, 76: "En employant 'Fils de Dieu' au lieu de simplement 'le Christ', Paul souligne la grandeur de celui auquel il croit...". Kieffer refers to Gal 4,4 (τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ) and Rom 1,4 (υἱοῦ θεοῦ): "Quand il s'agit de l'œuvre importante de notre salut, Paul aime donc souligner la qualité du Christ comme Fils de Dieu" (*ibid.*).

⁽³²⁾ BERENYI, "Gal 2,20", 536.

⁽³³⁾ *Ibid.*, 535.

the Son of God's act of delivering himself up" (34). Without love Christ would not have done this; without love his action would have no result.

Verse 21

"This sentence" is "abruptly introduced, without connective" (35). In the verb ἀθετέω (36) of v. 21a there is most probably a modal nuance: I am not going or I am not willing or I am not allowed to cancel (to render invalid, to nullify) the grace of God. In v. 20 Paul had beautifully indicated what riches are contained in the expression ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ (subj. gen.): God's grace is basically the gift of Christ, his person and all that he did, especially his dying out of love (37). While in v. 20d Christ himself is the active subject, here in v. 21a God has the initiative. We may refer to Rom 8,35.39: in v. 35 Paul writes: "Who shall separate us from the love of *Christ*?" (cf. v. 37), while in v. 39 he has: nobody and nothing "will be able to separate us from the love of *God* in Christ Jesus our Lord". Thus, without any difficulty Paul can move from Christ to God and from God to Christ. "In this expression 'the love of God in Christ Jesus' Paul makes a synthesis and shows that in reality God's love and Christ's love are the same thing" (38). How could Paul nullify God's grace? The context refers us back to v. 18a: by building up again what I pulled down, i. e., the prescriptions of the Law.

(34) Ibid., 536.

(35) BURTON, *Galatians*, 140.

(36) Paul uses ἀθετέω 4x, besides 2,21 in 1 Thess 4,8: probably the commandment dealt with in vv. 3-7, in 1 Cor 1,19: τὴν σύνεσιν (quotation from Isa 29,14), and in Gal 3,15: διαθήκην. Cf., e. g., M. LIMBECK, *EWNT* I, 83-85.

(37) Cf. H. D. BETZ, *Galatians* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia 1979) 126: "The concept of 'grace of God' ... describes the entire process of salvation in Christ". According to H. SCHLIER, *Der Brief an die Galater* (KEK; Göttingen 1962) 104, in v. 21a Paul reacts to an accusation of his opponents: you destroy God's grace, i. e., the Law or its righteousness or the circumcision. "Aber für Paulus ist es anders. Für ihn ist die χάρις die Gnade, die mit Christi Gehorsam übergeströmt ist...", thus not so much Christ himself as his grace in us. For a critique of this position see F. MUSSNER, *Der Galaterbrief* (HTKNT; Freiburg-Basel-Wien 1974) 184, n. 80.

(38) BERENYI, "Gal 2,20", 533.

V. 21bc repeats that idea of clinging to the Law by means of a more general formulation. We think that the conditional period of v. 21bc is in form again a "simple supposition", not an unreal one. The translation of the protasis should then be: "If justification *is*⁽³⁹⁾ through the Law". Of course, Paul is convinced of the opposite, but the grammatical form as such does not indicate this; it only stresses the logical connection between protasis and apodosis, between justification through the Law and its consequence, the useless death of Christ.

The expression *διὰ νόμου* of v. 21b has already appeared in v. 19a. The meaning there, however, is quite different. In v. 19 Paul speaks of his death together with Christ on the cross. Why in v. 19a did he write: "through the Law"? We may briefly comment on what we have already stated in our analysis of v. 19. Since Christ died on the cross, he became a curse through the Law and so redeemed us from the curse of that Law (3,13). Most probably Paul's reasoning in 3,10-14 implies that through not observing the Law we are sinners and, therefore, cursed by the Law (see 3,10); we cannot be justified by it. Only Christ, by becoming a curse and thus taking our place, brings redemption. In 2,19a Paul writes that the Law caused his death and in 19c that he has been crucified with Christ. This seems to imply that in some sense Christ's death as well is caused by the Law⁽⁴⁰⁾. This is true not because Christ violated the Law, but because he had to become cursed by the Law in order to redeem us from the curse of the Law. Admittedly, Paul writes in a very concise way. "Through the Law" in 2,19a contains, we think, the negative connotation that Paul like all humankind does not keep that Law.

In the protasis of 2,21b, however, the supposition is that there is justification *διὰ νόμου*, i. e., through observing the Law, through doing the works of the Law — which, of course, is impossible according to Paul. V. 21b formulates as a hypothesis something that is denied three times within v. 16, namely, that a person is justified by works of the Law. Suppose, Paul says in v. 21bc, that justification as a matter of fact occurs through the Law, then Christ's death is no longer needed, Christ died in vain. The expressions "by works of the Law" (v. 16) and "through the Law" (v. 21b) certainly point

⁽³⁹⁾ See note 8.

⁽⁴⁰⁾ NEITZEL, "Interpretation", 140, wrongly criticizes R. Bultmann because he states that the Law itself caused Jesus' death.

to observation and 'doing'. Yet doing itself is not wrong. On the contrary, it is "not keeping God's Law", the non-observation of that Law, that makes us all sinners (see Rom 3,23) so that we are in need of justification and redemption through Christ (and no longer through the Law)⁽⁴¹⁾.

V.21c draws the conclusion from v.21b. "The argument of the sentence is from a Christian point of view a *reductio ad absurdum*, and is adduced as proof of the preceding statement"⁽⁴²⁾. V.21c can be considered as a comment upon v.21a, its elaboration; v.21c is therefore also connected with v.18b.

We may conclude this long analysis as follows: by building up again the prescriptions of the Law (v.18a) Paul would nullify God's grace (v.21a). He would be acting as if there is justification through the Law (v.21b). If there is such justification, then Christ died in vain (v.21c). In v.18, however, Paul adds after the protasis "if I restore those prescriptions" the apodosis "I show myself a transgressor". Transgressor of what?

IV. Transgressor of what?

Can we now determine in what Paul's transgression consists? In nullifying God's grace? Is transgressing then the perfect equivalent of nullifying? "I transgress", however, is not simply "I declare invalid, I put aside, I nullify".

The terminology

In the NT παραβαίνω occurs three times (Mt 15,2,3; Acts 1,25), παράβασις seven times (Rom 2,23; 4,15; 5,14; Gal 3,19; 1 Tim 2,14;

⁽⁴¹⁾ Cf. J. LAMBRECHT, "Gesetzesverständnis bei Paulus", *Das Gesetz im Neuen Testament* (ed. K. KERTELGE) (QD 108; Freiburg-Basel-Wien 1986) 88-127 and "Vloek en zegen. Een Studie van Galaten 3,10-14", *Collationes* 21 (1991) (forthcoming).

⁽⁴²⁾ BURTON, *Galatians*, 141. Less correctly, it would seem, Burton sees in v.21a Paul's answer to his critics who object: "Throughout your doctrine you nullify God's greatest grace to Israel, i.e., the giving of the Law". So also SCHLIER, *Galater*, 104. We, however, connect v.21a with v.18. For Paul God's grace, of course, is Christ's death (cf. v.21c).

Heb 2,2; 9,15), and παραβάτης five times (Rom 2,25.27; Gal 2,18; Jas 2,9.11)⁽⁴³⁾.

(1) Παραβάνω. We can omit Acts 1,25 where the verb has another sense: Judas “turned aside” from the apostleship. In Mt 15 the disciples transgress the tradition (παράδοσις) of the elders (v. 2), the Pharisees and scribes the commandment (ἐντολή) of God (v. 3).

(2) Παράβασις. In 1 Tim 2,14 Eve committed a transgression (of God's commandment). Heb 2,2 speaks of a transgression of the word of the angels and 9,15 of transgressions of the Law. In Rom 2,23; 4,15 and Gal 3,19 Paul deals with transgressions of the Law, in Rom 5,14 with Adam's transgression of God's commandment.

(3) Παραβάτης. James in 2,9.11 writes about transgressor(s) of the Law, just as Paul in Rom 2,25.27. No objective genitive is present in Gal 2,18, but there is the immediate context where prescriptions (of the Law; v. 18a) and the Law itself (v. 19a; cf. vv. 16.21bc) are mentioned.

Leaving aside Gal 2,18, Paul five times uses παράβασις and παραβάτης for transgressing the Law, and once for Adam's transgression of a commandment. The conclusion cannot be avoided: Pauline usage as well as the context of Gal 2,18 force us to postulate after παραβάτης a legal concept: the Torah or some kind of commandment or law⁽⁴⁴⁾.

Transgressor of the Law?

So we are brought back to the two first proposals already mentioned at the beginning of this study. Paul is transgressing by either previous or future actions.

a. Previous action

Could Paul prove himself a transgressor because by becoming a Christian he destroyed the Law? We must then paraphrase as follows: “But if I build up again those things which I tore down, I recognize now that by my previous eating with the Gentiles I have violated the Law and have been a transgressor of that Law”. These

⁽⁴³⁾ For a brief discussion of these terms and bibliography see M. WOLTER, *EWNT* III, 32-35.

⁽⁴⁴⁾ Cf., e.g., NEITZEL, “Interpretation”, 134: “...was sonst macht einen Übertreter, wenn nicht eine Gesetzesübertretung?”.

things are the food laws, calendar prescriptions, and circumcision. One could easily enough understand such a reasoning on the part of Paul's Jewish-Christian opponents. For them καταλύω was a negative, sinful action. Building up again, then, is a retraction which manifests and confesses the wrong nature of the previous destruction⁽⁴⁵⁾.

Yet three reasons plead against this understanding. First, too much remains implicit, unsaid, in such a train of thought, more particularly the transition from "I show (now) that (then) I was a transgressor"⁽⁴⁶⁾. Second, συνιστάνω does not have elsewhere in Paul's letters the nuance of "I recognize, I confess", although this verb occurs therein twelve more times⁽⁴⁷⁾. Third, one cannot see how the γάρ sentence of v. 19 explains and motivates v. 18 when this interpretation is accepted. Must this second γάρ then again indicate a break: "But I through the Law died to the Law"? What I wrote in 1978 is still valid: "... a second non-causal use of γάρ immediately after that of v. 18 is not very probable", nor is an elliptical way of expression "within which we have to supply something like: '(This building up cannot make sense) for as a Christian through the Law I died to the Law'"⁽⁴⁸⁾.

b. Future actions

In view of the difficulties with this first proposal an alternative interpretation connected with Law presents itself. If Paul builds up

⁽⁴⁵⁾ Cf. LAGRANGE, *Galates*, 50: "Si l'on revient aux observances après y avoir renoncé, on reconnaît qu'on s'était trompé en les abandonnant, ce qui est se reconnaître transgresseur de la Loi". So recently again U. BORSE, *Der Brief an die Galater* (Regensb. NT; Regensburg 1984) 116: "Dass Kephas und die anderen sich zunächst über die jüdischen Speisegebote hinweggesetzt... hatten und sich danach wieder an sie hielten..., musste daraus gefolgert werden, dass sie sich mit ihrem früheren Verhalten schuldig wussten"; J. ROHDE, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Galater* (THKNT; Berlin 1989) 114: "Durch das Wiederaufbauen des Niedergerissenen bekenne ich, dass das Niederreißen Unrecht und Sünde war". Cf. BÖTTGER, "Paulus", 92.

⁽⁴⁶⁾ Cf. NEITZEL, "Interpretation", 131-132 (also for ancient and modern defenders of this first proposal).

⁽⁴⁷⁾ 9x in 2 Cor and 3x in Rom (further in Col 1,17; Lk 9,32 and 2 Pet 3,5). See n.9 and cf., e.g., BURTON, *Galatians*, 131-132; KIEFFER, *Foi*, 65-66; A. KRETZER, *EWNT* III, 737-739.

⁽⁴⁸⁾ LAMBRECHT, "Line of Thought", 483.

again what he has torn down, then, i.e., afterwards, by subsequent actions, he will prove himself a transgressor of that restored Law. H. Schlier writes: the Christian “richtet... die Macht wieder auf, die ihn... zum Übertreter macht”⁽⁴⁹⁾. As arguments in favor of this proposal we mention: οἰκοδομῶ is the main verb of the protasis; it stands at the end; it corresponds in tense with συνιστάνω. The idea which is supposed to be present is very Pauline. In the same letter to the Galatians, in 3,10, Paul states that all who rely on the works of the Law are under a curse because they do not keep all prescriptions of that Law. In 3,19 Paul states that the Law is added τῶν παραβάσεων χάριν till the offspring should come. If this verse is compared with 3,22 it appears that in Paul's view the Law concretely functions as a factor which does not limit but increases sin. According to Paul the Law came “not to reduce them [= the trespasses] but to produce them; not to restrain sin but to reveal that all things are under its domination (Gal 3.22), and even to stir it up ... (e.g. Rom 5.20; 7.5,8,11,13)”⁽⁵⁰⁾. Moreover, an oppositional connection between “Christ, an agent of sin” (v.17) and “Paul, future transgressor (of the Law)” becomes evident.

Several factors, however, make us hesitate with regard to this second proposal as well. In the first proposal there could be no doubt about what Paul has transgressed: the Law which contains the food prescriptions pointed to in v. 18a. In this second interpretation, however, the link between the object of transgressing in v. 18b and the ταῦτα ἃ κατέλυσα in v. 18a is not so clear since Paul is thinking of radical moral sin (cf. sinners and sin in vv. 15 and 17), not of breaking ceremonial prescriptions. Further, although theoretically speaking a future sense could be read into συνιστάνω, the reference to future transgressions is not so easy to accept in v. 18b. Moreover, it would have then the unusual sense “I will constitute myself”. Finally, the logical connection between v.18 and v.19 is equally difficult. “Here, again, the γάρ-clause of v.19 is hardly a simple explanation or motivation. γάρ is either the equivalent of ‘but’:

⁽⁴⁹⁾ SCHLIER, *Galater*, 97. Cf. WOLTER, *EWNT* III, 34: “die erneute Inkraftsetzung... des Gesetzes [erweist] jeden so nach einer Gerechtigkeit... Strebenden... als *Übertreter* (des Gesetzes)”. Neither Schlier nor Wolter makes the nuance of the future explicit.

⁽⁵⁰⁾ T. L. DONALDSON, “The ‘Curse of the Law’ and the Inclusion of the Gentiles: Galatians 3. 13-14”, *NTS* 32 (1986) 94-112, quotation on p. 104.

“*But I through the Law...*”; or it functions within an elliptical argumentation: “(This restoration of the Law which will again constitute me a transgressor of the law does not make sense) *for I through the Law...*”⁽⁵¹⁾. But these solutions for γάρ are rather improbable.

Transgressor of the new command?

E.D. Burton opines that Paul in v.18 wrote “transgressor” because of “the usage of his opponents, who employed ἁματωλός rather than παραβάτης for the Gentiles... who... did not observe the requirements of the law”⁽⁵²⁾. Paul was thus compelled to resort to “transgressor”. Had he been free, “the apostle might naturally have precisely reversed this usage...”⁽⁵³⁾. Burton’s hypothesis is linked up with his view that the term “sinners” in v.17a may ultimately come from “an actual or supposed objector” and that Paul was forced to give this term an ambiguous meaning⁽⁵⁴⁾. Yet he clearly sees the difficulty: normally speaking, παραβάτης is a violator of the Law. “The statement that not by disobeying but by obeying the statutes of the law he (= Paul) becomes a transgressor is... obviously paradoxical...”⁽⁵⁵⁾.

To be sure, because of the Pauline use of παραβάτης and because of the specific content of v.18a (restoration of Law prescriptions) one expects after “transgressor” the objective genitive “Law”; one tends spontaneously to supply its absence. Yet, immediately afterwards, v.19a points to a new situation: Paul is dead to the Law; and in v.19b there is the ἵνα-clause which formulates the new command: a Christian must live for God. Does the transgression of v.18b not precisely consist in the building up again of the Law which would make obedience to that new command no longer possible? The transgressor does “violence to

⁽⁵¹⁾ LAMBRECHT, “Line of Thought”, 494.

⁽⁵²⁾ BURTON, *Galatians*, 131.

⁽⁵³⁾ Ibid.

⁽⁵⁴⁾ Ibid., 125.

⁽⁵⁵⁾ See *ibid.*, 131. Cf. G. BOUWMAN, “‘Christus Diener der Sünde’. Auslegung von Galater 2,14b-18”, *Bijdragen* 40 (1979) 44-54: “...das Gesetz als Heilsmöglichkeit neben Christus wieder aufrichten wollen, ist keine Übertretung, sondern *die* Sünde schlechthin. Aber Paulus schreibt eben παράβασις und dieses Wort hat bei ihm immer eine Verbindung mit dem Gesetz...” (48). According to Bouwman Paul uses παραβάτης in the sense of transgressor of the restored Law because of the objection of the opponents (= v. 17); see pp. 48-49.

the Will of God as clearly revealed in Christ”⁽⁵⁶⁾. In the second proposal above the restoration was not the transgression: the restoration would inevitably lead to transgression of the Law. Here in our proposal it is the restoration itself which also transgresses the new command to live solely for God.

Yet one still hesitates and persists in asking whether it is not too far-fetched to look at “living to God” in v. 19a as a command that can be transgressed. Moreover, we have to admit, the content parallelisms between vv. 18a and 21b as well as between vv. 18b and 21a are not perfect. On the other hand, three more observations seem to corroborate that interpretation.

Additional observations

(1) Within this third tentative interpretation the motivating sentence of v. 19 works nicely in a logical way⁽⁵⁷⁾. The underlying idea is that I am not permitted to re-establish the Law because I died to it by becoming a Christian; I am not permitted to transgress the life-command that results from that death.

(2) Just like the noun παραβάτης, the verb ἁθετέω is also a legal term. After this verb one expects as direct object a command, an agreement or a law⁽⁵⁸⁾. Just as in v. 18b the object in v. 21a is not the Torah; otherwise than in v. 18b, however, the object is mentioned: God's grace.

(3) The idea of refusing and rejecting God's grace is present in other passages of Paul's letters as well. We may refer to Galatians itself where Paul in 1,6 expresses his astonishment: “you are so quickly moving away from (μετατίθεσθε ἀπό) him who called you in the grace of God”. In 5,4 he writes: “You are severed from (κατηργήθητε ἀπό) Christ, you who would be justified by the Law, you have fallen away from grace (τῆς χάριτος ἐξέπεσατε)”, and in 5,11 he states that the preaching of circumcision would mean that the stumbling block of the cross has been removed (κατήργηται).

⁽⁵⁶⁾ G. S. DUNCAN, *The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians* (Moffatt NT Comm.; London 1944 [= 1934]). Cf. A. VAN DÜLMEN, *Die Theologie des Gesetzes* (SBM 5; Stuttgart 1968) 21 and G. SCHNEIDER, *Der Brief an die Galater* (Geistl. Schriftlesung; Düsseldorf 1964) 61-62; these two authors do not point to the command present in God's grace. See also n. 6 and NEITZEL, “Interpretation”, 136-137: Jewish Christians who come back to the works of the Law “athetieren nämlich die Gnade Gottes” (137).

⁽⁵⁷⁾ Cf. BURTON, *Galatians*, 131.

⁽⁵⁸⁾ See n. 36.

The most vigorous passage, however, is Rom 9,30–10,4 where Paul in 9,32 says about Israel that they have stumbled over (προσέκοψαν) the stumbling stone, in 10,2 that their zeal is not enlightened (οὐ κατ' ἐπίγνωσιν), and in 10,3 that they were ignorant (ἄγνοοῦντες) of God's righteousness and did not submit (οὐχ ὑπετάγησαν) to it (see also 10,21: λαὸς ἀπειθοῦν καὶ ἀντιλέγων).

Of course, all these remarks do not directly prove that in Gal 2,18b Paul thought of a transgressor of God's new initiative in Christ and the command it implies, but at least they indicate for Paul the possibility of that idea.

Conclusion

If our own proposal possesses any value, as we think it does, then one will notice that there is a kind of identification between nullifying (v.21a) and transgressing (v.18b), in so far as one who nullifies God's grace by the same token transgresses the life command it contains. As a matter of fact, by the restoration of the Law Paul would destroy God's grace and become *ipso facto* a transgressor of that new command to live for God. What further "commends this third understanding of παραβάτης is the fact that in it vv.18-21 form a small unit, framed by v.18b and v.21a, expressing the same idea" ⁽⁵⁹⁾: I am not going to be a transgressor, I am not going to nullify God's grace. In the final analysis Paul does not want to become a transgressor by nullifying the grace of God!

Waversebaan 220
B - 3001 Leuven (Heverlee)
Belgium

Jan LAMBRECHT, SJ

SOMMAIRE

Cet article examine le sens exact du mot "transgresseur" en Ga 2,18b. "Transgresser", ici, ne signifie ni avoir péché contre la Loi en raison d'actions antérieures (manger avec les Gentils), ni pécher par une conduite subséquente (il ne sera pas possible d'observer toutes les prescriptions de la Loi restaurée). Notre étude envisage une autre possibilité. Dans le v. 18b, Paul pense, à notre avis, au commandement de vie attaché à la mort rédemptrice du Christ sur la croix. En restaurant la Loi (2,18a), Paul annulerait la grâce de Dieu (2,21a) et *ipso facto* deviendrait un transgresseur (2,18b) du nouveau commandement qui requiert de vivre pour Dieu (2,19b). Une analyse serrée de cette ligne de pensée à l'intérieur de 2,14b-21 et un traitement en profondeur de la terminologie de la "transgression" (*parabainein*) corroborent l'argumentation.

⁽⁵⁹⁾ LAMBRECHT, "Line of Thought", 494.

ANIMADVERSIONES

Jonah 2,9 and the Structure of Jonah's Prayer

The beautiful little psalm in Jonah 2,3-10⁽¹⁾, "The Prayer of Jonah", exhibits a text in a good state of preservation and few difficulties as regards the meaning of individual terms⁽²⁾, features that make it an ideal subject for the study of Hebrew poetry. Small wonder, then, that it has been the subject of a number of studies in recent years⁽³⁾. At least four of these have devoted some attention to the question of structure⁽⁴⁾. J. T. Walsh posits four stanzas: vv. 3.4-5.6-8.9-10⁽⁵⁾. F. M. Cross also gives four, but broken down as follows: vv. 3-4.5.6-7.8-10⁽⁶⁾. D. L. Christensen divides into five stanzas: vv. 3.4-5.6-7a.7b-8.9-10⁽⁷⁾. J. M. Sasson's division is: vv. 3-4.5-9.10⁽⁸⁾. Apart from agreement on beginning the poem at v. 3, there is no consensus on where the other stanzas begin. Two of the studies start a new section at v. 4, two at v. 5, three at v. 6, one at v. 8, two at v. 9, and one at v. 10.

The disagreements in these studies — all from accomplished scholars — only serve to show that interpreting the structure of a Hebrew poem is still far from an exact science. At times it is difficult to state with conviction just where one should mark the beginning of one (sub)section or the end of another; there are guidelines but few absolute rules. One such rule,

⁽¹⁾ For the subdivision of verses used in this article, the reader is referred to the chart in section II.

⁽²⁾ The one poetic line that might be considered problematic would be 6c-7a. On this bicolon, see my article, "Wrapped Up in the Netherworld: Jonah 2:6-7 and Job 40:13" (forthcoming).

⁽³⁾ J. T. WALSH, "Jonah 2,3-10: A Rhetorical Critical Study", *Bib* 63 (1982) 219-229; F. M. CROSS, "Studies in the Structure of Hebrew Verse: The Prosody of the Psalm of Jonah", *The Quest for the Kingdom of God: Studies in Honor of George E. Mendenhall* (ed. H. B. HUFFMON, et al.) (Winona Lake 1983) 159-167; D. L. CHRISTENSEN, "The Song of Jonah: A Metrical Analysis", *JBL* 104 (1985) 217-231; idem, "Narrative Poetics and the Interpretation of the Book of Jonah", *Directions in Biblical Hebrew Poetry* (ed. E. R. FOLLIS) (JSOTSS 40; Sheffield 1987) 29-48; J. S. ACKERMAN, "Satire and Symbolism in the Song of Jonah", *Traditions in Transformation: Turning Points in Biblical Faith* (ed. B. HALPERN—J. D. LEVENSON) (Winona Lake 1981) 213-246; J. M. SASSON, *Jonah* (AB 24B; New York 1990) 165-167; see also J. MAGONET, *Form and Meaning: Studies in Literary Techniques in the Book of Jonah* (Bible and Literature Series; Sheffield 1983) 39-54.

⁽⁴⁾ WALSH, "Jonah 2,3-10"; CROSS, "The Psalm of Jonah"; CHRISTENSEN, "The Song of Jonah"; SASSON, *Jonah*.

⁽⁵⁾ WALSH, "Jonah 2,3-10", 220-224.

⁽⁶⁾ CROSS, "The Psalm of Jonah", 161-167.

⁽⁷⁾ CHRISTENSEN, "The Song of Jonah", 223-224. He begins the fourth division of the poem proper with *hā'āreš* in v. 7.

⁽⁸⁾ SASSON, *Jonah*, 166.

however, is syntax. Simply put, although the division of a body of material into smaller units is to some extent subjective, one must always take into account the laws of grammar. This means, for example, that if two bicola are connected syntactically, one may not separate them, assigning the first to one unit and the second to a subsequent one.

I. The Interpretation of v. 9

Has such a separation occurred in the case of the Prayer of Jonah? The answer depends on how one parses the first word in v. 9: *mēšammērīm hablê-šāw' // ḥasdām ya'āzōbū* which the *NRSV* translates: Those who worship vain idols // forsake their true loyalty.

As it is commonly understood (exemplified by the foregoing translation), the bicolon fits uncomfortably into its context. It seems to be parenthetical at best. Most recently Sasson has labeled it an "observation" or an "aside" (°). This fact alone should lead one to suspect that something is wrong with the traditional understanding of the function of this verse within the poem.

The MT points *mšmrym* as a piel participle. But *šmr* does not occur elsewhere in biblical or Qumranic⁽¹⁰⁾ Hebrew in the piel. The appearance of the same phrase in Ps 31,7 — *ḥaššōmērīm hablê-šāw'*, where the participle is unmistakably in the qal — provides telling evidence against the MT reading. The alternative would be to parse the word in question as the qal participle preceded by the preposition *min*, as did Aquila⁽¹¹⁾. But this would make v. 9 syntactically inseparable from v. 8. In this case v. 9 cannot begin a new subsection.

I shall now present arguments for an alternative interpretation of v. 9. One of the unresolved issues in the exegesis of this verse is the nuance of *šmr*. If *hablê-šāw'* refers to false gods, the generally accepted view, the use of this verb is problematic. It does not elsewhere have deities as its object, whether Yahweh or other gods. E. Jenni has proposed that rather than "guard, protect" *šmr* here means "to worship", a meaning attested in the Akkadian cognate *šamāru*⁽¹²⁾.

This solution, however, is deficient because it neglects to take into consideration the verb in the second colon. Like other interpretations, it assumes that v. 9 is an example of "synthetic" parallelism (to use Lowth's terminology) and thus that there is no correlation between the two verbs; *mšmrym* is simply construed as the subject of *ya'āzōbū*⁽¹³⁾. But another

(°) *Jonah*, 166.

(10) In this literature, the use of the *mater lectionis* waw in *yqtl* and infinitive forms of the root *šmr* makes it clear that all occurrences are in the qal, none in the piel (IQS 2,3; 5,2,9; 8,3; 10,21,25; 1QM 7,2; 14,4,8; 1QH 16,13,17; f 3,7; 4QM^a 2; CD 6,18; 10,16; 16,7; 19,1,9). However, in rabbinic Hebrew the verb does occur in the piel.

(11) ἀπό φυλασσόντων ματαιότητα εἰκῆ.

(12) E. JENNI, *Das hebräische Piel: Syntaktisch-semasiologische Untersuchung einer Verbalform im Alten Testament* (Zurich 1968) 223.

(13) To my knowledge Walsh was the first (and only) commentator to make reference to a connection between these words ("Jonah 2,3-10", 224): "[In v. 9]

interpretation is possible. Often enough in Hebrew poetry the relative force of a participle is continued in the subsequent colon by a finite verb. For example, Ps 91,1:

yôšēb b'šēter 'elyôn // b'šēl šadday yitlônān
He who dwells in the shelter of Elyon,
who tarries in the shade of Shaddai

not "...will tarry/tarries in the shade of Shaddai" (cf. LXX, Vulgate). Compare Ps 119,2:

'ašrē nōšerē 'ēdōtāyw // b'kol-lēb yidrēšūhū
Happy are those who observe his statutes,
who seek him with all their heart

not "...will seek/seek him with all their heart" (cf. LXX, Vulgate)⁽¹⁴⁾.

It is possible to construe the participle and verb in Jonah 2,9 as being in "synonymous" parallelism as in the passages listed above. This view receives support from the fact that the verbs appear together elsewhere in the MT, where they are always related as opposites. In these texts the nuance of *zb* comes close to "neglect, disregard":

Ps 89,31-32:

'im ya'azbū bānāyw tōrātī ... // 'im ... mišwōtay lō' yišmōrū
If his sons *disregard* my instruction ...
if they do not *keep* my commandments

Ps 119,87-88:

wa'ānī lō'-'āzabtī piqqûdekā // k'ḥasdēkā ḥayyēnī //
we'ešmērā 'ēdūt pīkā
But I have not *disregarded* your statutes—
give me life according to your steadfast love!—
and I have *kept* the testimonies of your mouth.

See also Prov 28,4⁽¹⁵⁾; 2 Chr 7,17.19 and 2 Chr 13,11⁽¹⁶⁾.

there is... a chiasmic structure on two levels. Grammatically, two verbal forms surround two nominal forms; semantically two antithetic attitudes ('clinging'/'abandoning') surround two abstractions ('empty nothings'/'loyalty').

⁽¹⁴⁾ The following passages from the Psalter are further examples of this phenomenon (more could be listed): Pss 18,48; 38,21; 49,7; 66,9; 77,15; 84,5; 89,16-17; 94,20-21; 104,32; 112,5; 136,10-11.17-18. In some cases it is difficult to decide whether the finite verb in the second colon continues the relative force of the participle or functions as its predicate. For example, Ps 84,5: *'ašrē yôšēbē bētekā // 'ōd y'hallēlūkā*. Should this be translated, "Happy are they who dwell in your house! [for] they continually praise you" (cf. *NAB*), or "Happy are they who dwell in your house, *who* continually praise you"?

⁽¹⁵⁾ Reading perhaps *bō-m* (i.e., with enclitic *mem*) for MT *bām*.

⁽¹⁶⁾ Another example may occur in Hos 4,10-12a, which could be interpreted as follows:

Indeed, they have *abandoned/disregarded* Yahweh,
truly, they *hold to* harlotry and wine(-bibbing).

To these examples one should add the related correlation of *šmr* and *pr'* (with the meaning "disregard") in Prov 8,32-33; 29,18⁽¹⁷⁾ and of "keep" and "disregard" in Akkadian. In the Amarna correspondence, for example, "keeping, guarding" (*našāru*) the command of the king contrasts with "abandoning, disregarding" (*ezēbu*) his command⁽¹⁸⁾.

These passages make it clear that the relationship between the two verbs is more than merely structural and extends beyond Jonah 2,9. Rather, they are correlated as opposites of each other in a number of passages, where they have to do with keeping or disregarding one's obligations.

These facts have significant implications for the interpretation of Jonah 2,9. In all of the OT passages cited above: (a) *šmr* is in the qal, never the piel; (b) the verb has its normal sense, "to keep, observe, etc.". It therefore becomes all the more difficult to accept the prevailing view that *mšmrym* in the Prayer of Jonah is a unique piel form or that it bears a unique meaning, "to worship".

But the texts cited reveal something else as well. In no case is the object of *šmr* a deity. All of this makes it quite unlikely that *hablē-šāw'* means "idols" — either here or in Ps 31,7⁽¹⁹⁾. If the syntax of 2,9 is as I have suggested, then to *šmr* these things is precisely the opposite of to 'zb "their steadfast love". At this point we must look at the second colon, *ḥsdām ya'āzōbū*.

In light of what we have seen, this expression is the opposite of *šmr ḥesed*, "to keep/hold to 'steadfast love'" (Deut 7,9,12; 1 Kgs 3,6; 8,23; Ps 89,29; Neh 1,5; 2 Chr 6,14; and esp. Hos 12,7). From the suffix *-ām* it is clear that the *ḥesed* under discussion is not Yahweh's but that of certain Israelites; cf. "your (pl.) *ḥesed*" in Hos 6,6. On the human side, this means to act in accordance with a particular relationship characterized by *ḥesed* — i.e., the covenant. Therefore "to abandon one's 'steadfast love'" would be to act so as to disregard one's covenant obligations⁽²⁰⁾.

Here I have parsed MT *lišmōr* as *lū šāmōr* — viz., the emphatic *lū* with the absolute infinitive, continuing the thought of the preceding line (see GKC §113z). For this structure of the verses in question, see F. I. ANDERSEN—D. N. FREEDMAN, *Hosea* (AB 24; Garden City 1980) 342-343, 363.

⁽¹⁷⁾ On the meaning of *pr'* in Wisdom literature, see J. G. JANZEN, "The Root *pr'* in Judges v 2 and Deuteronomy xxxii 42", *VT* 39 (1989) 394-396.

⁽¹⁸⁾ Cf. *EAT* 88,28-29: *anāku awat bēliya ul ezzib*, "I did not 'forsake' [= disregard] the command of (the king,) my lord" (cf. *EAT* 1,62-63; 211,18-20); and *EAT* 294,11-13: *anumma iššuru awat ša qaba šarru bēliya ana yāši*, "Truly, I have 'kept' the command that the king, my lord, gave me". In this correspondence the same verbs are also used with reference to "guarding" or "abandoning" a particular city belonging to the Egyptian king (*EAT* 114,28-31; 126,44-48; 129,46-48; 197,38-40). Here too the contrast is between faithfulness to and neglect of one's obligations. On *ezēbu* in the sense of "neglecting, disregarding (commands, etc.)", see *CAD* E, 418-419; *AHW*, 268.

⁽¹⁹⁾ Although *hebel* is used in the OT, particularly in Deuteronomistic literature, to refer to false gods (e.g., Deut 32,21; 2 Kgs 17,15; Jer 8,19), and although *šāw'* occasionally has the same meaning (e.g., Jer 18,15), the plural construct form with *šāw'* occurs only in Ps 31,7; Jonah 2,9.

⁽²⁰⁾ "The absence of *ḥesed* is the wholesale abandonment of the stipulations of the decalogue; it is the absence of justice and righteousness in Israelite society" (K. D. SAKENFELD, *The Meaning of Hesed in the Hebrew Bible: A New Inquiry* [HSM 17; Missoula 1978] 175).

How then are we to translate *hablê-šāw'*? It is probably some kind of parody of *ḥesed*, perhaps something like "faithless practices", i.e., referring to actions rather than deities. The construction with *šmr* may have been formed on the analogy of *šmr ḥesed*. If *ḥesed* connotes something that is supposed to be lasting, permanent (though human *ḥesed* seldom is — cf. Hos 6,4; Isa 40,6-8), its opposite could well be termed *hablê-šāw'*. "To hold to 'faithless practices'", then, would mean to perform those actions which would deny or undermine the *ḥesed* relationship with Yahweh and/or one's fellow Israelites⁽²¹⁾. Thus the reference in v.9 is to the "wicked", portrayed specifically as those who have in effect renounced the covenant with the God of Israel. A rough translation that captures the gist of this verse would be:

miššōm'erîm [MT: *m'šamm'erîm*] *hablê-šāw'*
ḥasdām ya'āzōbū

From (among) those who hold to faithless practices,
 who abandon/disregard their covenant fidelity.

II. The Structure of the Prayer

Reinterpreting v.9 necessitates a reconsideration of the structure of the poem as a whole. As I see it, the poem divides into seven sections⁽²²⁾. The first three are of equal length, each consisting of 11 words. The middle section, D, is the longest, with 16 words⁽²³⁾. The last three mirror A, B and C as regards length, also consisting of 11 words each (except for the last, G, with 10 words). Thus D is half the length of A-B-C (33 words) and of E-F-G (32 words). Of the seven sections, all but the first and the center member (A and D) are introduced by *wa-*. Nowhere else in the psalm is a bicolon introduced by this conjunction. In fact, in three of the five cases the section begins with *watta-*, i.e., the copula followed by a *yql* form, either 2nd masc. s. (vv.4,7d) or 3rd fem. s. (8c)⁽²⁴⁾; the remaining two begin with *wa'ānī* (vv.5,10). Thus both A-B-C and E-F-G conclude with a stanza

⁽²¹⁾ Cf. *lšmr z'nūt w'eyayin*, "Truly, they hold to harlotry and wine(-bibbing)" in Hos 4,10-12a. See above, n.16.

⁽²²⁾ The poem contains several other examples of the "seven" pattern. It has seven terms referring to watery chaos: *m'šûlâ*, *yammîm*, *nāhār*, *mišbārēkâ*, *gallēkâ*, *mayim*, *ʿhôm* (vv.4-6b). There are seven 1st pers. s. verbs in the *qtl*: *qārātī* (3a), *šiwwā'tī* (3c), *'āmartī* (5a), *nigraštī* (5b), *yāradtī* (7b), *zākārtī* (8b), and *nādartī* (10c). Allusion is made to the divine presence seven times: the divine names *yhwḥ* (3b.7e.8b.10d), *'ēlōhāy* (7e), and the temple (5d.8d).

⁽²³⁾ It is also noteworthy that in the three other passages where the vocable *'āpāpūnī* occurs it begins a new (sub)section: Ps 18,5 // 2 Sam 22,5 (see G. RAVASI, *Il Libro dei Salmi: Volume 1° (1-50)* [Bologna 1988] 326); Ps 116,3 (see M. L. BARRE, "Psalm 116: Its Structure and Its Enigmas", *JBL* 109 [1990] 61, 66).

⁽²⁴⁾ In Jonah 2,3-10, wherever a *qtl* verb is followed by a *waw*-conversive there is a transition to a new stanza (except in v.3ab). Note *šāma'tā* in 3d (stanza A) followed by *wattašlikēnī* in 4a (stanza B); *yāradtī* in 7c (stanza D) followed by *watta'al* in 7d (stanza E); and *zākārtī* in 8b (stanza E) followed by *wattābō'* in 8c (stanza F).

introduced by *wa'ānī*⁽²⁵⁾. A (v.3) functions as an introduction, anticipating the themes of distress (3a) and deliverance (3b-d). Thematically, sections B-C-D form the first part of the poem, with E-F-G forming the second⁽²⁶⁾.

Proem

- A 3a Out of my distress I called
 b to Yahweh, and he answered me;
 c From the belly of Sheol I cried out
 d (and) you heard my voice.

Part I

- B 4a You cast me into the abyss,
 b into the midst of the seas;
 c the (primordial) river engulfed me.
 d All your breakers and your waves
 e washed over me.
- C 5a And I said:
 b "I am banished from your presence!
 c O that⁽²⁷⁾ I might gaze once again
 d on your holy temple!"
- D 6a The waters surrounded me up to my neck,
 b the deep engulfed me.
 c Perdition⁽²⁸⁾ was wrapped around my head,
 7a (I was buried) at the roots of the mountains.
 b I descended to the netherworld—
 c its gate-bars (locked) behind⁽²⁹⁾ me forever.

⁽²⁵⁾ Sasson also scans v. 10 as a separate stanza (*Jonah*, 165-166).

⁽²⁶⁾ One objection to this analysis of the structure concerns the repeated phrase *'el-hēkal qodšekā* (5d.8d). In the view of WALSH, "Jonah 2,3-10", 221-222, and CHRISTENSEN, "The Song of Jonah", 225, it serves to designate the end of two structural units, whereas in the analysis presented above it delimits stanza C but occurs in the middle of F. The reason for this is that F is a quatrain, the first bicolon (8cd) being inseparable syntactically from the second (9ab). One finds the same phenomenon in Psalm 116. There the bicolon *nēdāray l'yhwh 'āšallēm // negdānnā' l'kol-ammō* (v. 14) ends the first half of Part II (vv. 10-19). It is repeated, not at the very end of the section, as might be expected, but in the penultimate v. 18, where it forms a quatrain with v. 19: *bēḥarōt bēt yhwh // b'etōkēki y'rūsālāim* (see BARRÉ, "Psalm 116", 61-62).

⁽²⁷⁾ A number of commentators prefer to read MT *'ak* as *'ēk*, "how?" (cf. Theodotion's πῶς). In this case one would translate, "How can I ever again gaze // on your holy temple?"

⁽²⁸⁾ For *sūp* as "perdition, destruction", see B. F. BATTO, "The Reed Sea: *Requiescat in Pace*," *JBL* 102 (1983) 32-34. On this bicolon in general, see my article, "Wrapped Up in the Netherworld: Jonah 2:6-7 and Job 40:13" (forthcoming).

⁽²⁹⁾ Some translations have "around" for *ba'ādī* (SASSON, *Jonah*, 160; *NJB*).

Part II

- E d But (then) you raised up my life from the pit,
 e O Yahweh my God!
 8a (For) when my soul within me had grown weak
 b I remembered Yahweh ⁽³⁰⁾.
- F c And my prayer came to you,
 d to your holy temple,
 9a From (among) those who hold to faithless practices,
 b who abandon/disregard their covenant fidelity.
- G 10a But I, with a voice (full) of praise,
 b will offer sacrifice to you;
 c what I have vowed I will fulfill, (saying:)
 d "Salvation is from Yahweh (alone)"!

The major difference between the understanding of the structure presented here and those of the three authors cited above concerns E. I see a major structural seam in the poem here, i.e., after v. 7c ⁽³¹⁾. Two pieces of evidence indicate this: the first is structural, the second thematic.

The structural evidence concerns a particular type of bicolon in which the second colon is longer than the first. In his study of this passage Cross deals with the configuration of long and short cola, which he designates *longum* (*l*) and *breve* (*b*). His structuring of the poem is based on what he sees as a chiasmic pattern composed of long and short cola. Thus vv. 3-4 would be *b:l::l:b l:b::b:l* ⁽³²⁾. But this analysis is open to question. First, each colon in v. 3 contains exactly three words and seven syllables, so that one cannot properly speak of either being "long" or "short" ⁽³³⁾. Then Cross breaks up v. 4cd so that *w^egallèkā* belongs to the second colon. But this division too is debatable ⁽³⁴⁾. The two cola each exhibit a particular sound-play, as Walsh has noted: *-èkā* at the end of the last two words in 4c, and *-ā-* at the beginning of the first two words in 4d, a pattern that is destroyed if one divides the colon as Cross does. Finally, Cross finds a

Though the word can have this meaning in some contexts, it cannot in this passage. One is certainly meant to envision here the giant city-gate of Sheol slamming shut *behind* the unfortunate psalmist after he has entered (cf. *ba'ad* in Gen 7,16; Judg 3,23; 9,51; 2 Kgs 4,4.5.33; Isa 26,20). It is difficult to see how *b^erihîm* could be "around" someone, since the term does not mean "bars" like those of modern prisons but rather the "bars" of a gate.

⁽³⁰⁾ This is the only occurrence in the poem of the *nota accusativi*, which is rare in poetry. Another possible reading of this colon would therefore be *'attā yhw^h zākārî,* "I remembered you, O Yahweh" (see M. DAHOOD, "The Independent Personal Pronoun in the Oblique Case in Hebrew", *CBQ* 32 [1970] 86).

⁽³¹⁾ *NJB* also begins a stanza after 7c.

⁽³²⁾ Cross, "The Psalm of Jonah", 161.

⁽³³⁾ See also SASSON, *Jonah*, 210.

⁽³⁴⁾ *Ibid.*, 211.

b:l:l:b pattern in v. 5. He is surely correct in this case. But his premise of a “binary correspondence” of bicola⁽³⁵⁾ may not hold true for this verse, as *wa’ānī ’āmartī* could well be scanned as a monocolon followed by a tricolon⁽³⁶⁾. In this case the pattern would be *b:l:l:b:b* — i.e., 6:8:6:6 syllables. This leaves only one bicolon in the entire poem that unmistakably exhibits the *b:l* pattern, viz., 7bc. Not only the syllable-count (4/5:9)⁽³⁷⁾ but the word-count (2:3) makes this clear. Now the great majority of Hebrew bicola consist of a *longum* followed by a *breve*. Somewhat less frequent are bicola in which the two cola are of equal length (as in Jonah 2,3ab). But those in which the first colon is shorter than the second are less common. In a good many cases such bicola mark the end of a unit — for example, in Exod 15,1-18 (v. 5: 2/4 words)⁽³⁸⁾; Isa 38,9-20 (v. 14cd: 3/4 words), Pss 34 (v. 11: 3/6 words); 63 (v. 12 [end]: 3/4/5 words). The fact that v. 7bc is the only bicolon exhibiting the *b:l* pattern in the Prayer of Jonah is structurally significant — it marks the end of a unit⁽³⁹⁾.

Thematic considerations also point to a major shift in the direction of the poem at this point. The poet’s “descent”, which begins in v. 4, reaches its nadir in v. 7c, with the mention of the netherworld (*hā’āreš*). The finality of this line is underscored by depicting the gate-bars of the underworld city⁽⁴⁰⁾ having closed shut behind the psalmist, a detail which would preclude any hope of escape or return to the land of the living; and by the last word in the verse, *l’ōlām*, which further reinforces the aspect of finality. The unfortunate poet has entered the netherworld, the gates have shut behind him, there is no hope of getting out — end of story. After this, the appearance of *watta’al* in 7d comes as a great surprise and signals a sharp upward turn in the direction of the poem. With this word begins his “ascent”⁽⁴¹⁾, which culminates with his prayer reaching Yahweh in his

⁽³⁵⁾ CROSS, “The Psalm of Jonah”, 159.

⁽³⁶⁾ Verse 5a meets the criteria for a monocolon as set forth by W.G.E. WATSON, *Classical Hebrew Poetry: A Guide to its Techniques* (JSOTSS 26; Sheffield 1984) 169-170.

⁽³⁷⁾ CROSS, “The Psalm of Jonah”, 159, reads the second word as *’rš* as against MT *h’rš*. The latter would yield five rather than four syllables for this colon.

⁽³⁸⁾ See D.N. Freedman’s discussion of the structure of this poem in his *Pottery, Poetry and Prophecy: Studies in Early Hebrew Poetry* (Winona Lake 1980) esp. 195-197.

⁽³⁹⁾ In Hebrew poetry the conclusion of a section is frequently indicated by breaking a pattern. See, for example, the remarks of R. ALTER, *The Art of Biblical Poetry* (New York 1985) 7; A. BERLIN, *The Dynamics of Biblical Parallelism* (Bloomington 1985) 87.

⁽⁴⁰⁾ Cf. the netherworld visualized as a city in the Prayer of Hezekiah (Isa 38,9-20), a poem that exhibits a number of similarities to the Psalm of Jonah (on this point, see J.A. SOGGIN, “Il ‘segno di Giona’ nel libro del profeta Giona”, *Lateranum* 48 [1982] 72-74). In Isa 38,10 the poet speaks of having to depart to “the gates of Sheol” (*bēša’ārē šē’ōl*).

⁽⁴¹⁾ Christensen, however, takes *hā’āreš bērihēhā ba’ādī l’ōlām* (v. 7bc) as the starting point of “Jonah’s Ascent ‘from the Pit’” (“The Song of Jonah”, 223). But this can hardly be correct. Far from beginning the description of the ascent, these words mark the climax of the downward movement.

temple (v. 8d)⁽⁴²⁾. The appearance of this verb is significant for another reason. It is the first occurrence of a 2nd pers. s. verb since *wattašlikēnī* in 4a⁽⁴³⁾, which likewise has Yahweh as its subject; it too marks the beginning of a major section of the poem (Part I) and begins the downward journey. God, who had cast the psalmist down to the power of death, now raises him up to life. One would expect this abrupt shift to be reflected in the structure.

Other arguments besides the thematic shift mentioned above point to E as the beginning of a major segment of the poem. The distribution of divine names within poetry is often an important structural clue, as has been noted by D.N. Freedman⁽⁴⁴⁾ and most recently by R. Youngblood⁽⁴⁵⁾. The name *yhw* appears once in the first bicolon (3b) and again at the very end (10d). It occurs twice more in E (vv. 7e.8b) along with *'ēlōhay* (7e). In A and G the name obviously has an inclusory function, as frequently in the Psalter. But why the piling up of divine names in E? The presence of this feature may mark E as a major juncture in the poem.

E also shows connections with D. The most obvious and important is, of course, *watta'al miššaḥat* (7d), reversing *yāradtī hā'āreṣ* (7b). In addition, these two sections contain the only occurrences of the noun *nepeš* in the poem: in both 6a and 8a it occurs in a life-threatening context.

Moreover, E displays certain features that identify it as a self-contained unit — i.e., it is independent not only of the preceding material but also of vv. 8c-10. In his study of this poem Walsh has pointed out that each colon of the opening stanza of the poem (A) ends with the sound -ī, which in each case belongs to a first person termination of some sort⁽⁴⁶⁾. The only other place in the poem where we find a similar pattern is in E, the opening stanza of Part II, where the endings of the cola are likewise 1st pers. s.: -ay, -ay, -ī, -ī⁽⁴⁷⁾. Other devices within E that tie its cola together are the use of *yhw*/*'et-yhw* beginning the second colon of each

⁽⁴²⁾ As the netherworld represents the lowest point in the cosmos, the temple stands for the highest point, whether one takes *hēkāl* to refer to the temple in heaven or in Jerusalem. There is less of a distinction between the two than the modern Western reader might imagine, since the Jerusalem temple stands atop "Mount" Zion, the point where the divine (upper) and human (lower) worlds meet.

⁽⁴³⁾ In fact, *watta'al* is the only 2d pers. verb in E-F-G, as is *wattašlikēnī* in B-C-D. The only other such verb in the psalm is *šama'ā* in A (3d).

⁽⁴⁴⁾ D.N. FREEDMAN, "The Structure of Isaiah 40:1-11", *Perspectives on Language and Text: Essays and Poems in Honor of Francis I. Andersen's Sixtieth Birthday-June 28, 1985* (ed. E.W. CONRAD-E.G. NEWING) (Winona Lake 1987) 167-193.

⁽⁴⁵⁾ R. YOUNGBLOOD, "Divine Names in the Book of Psalms: Literary Structures and Number Patterns", *JANESCU* 19 (1989) 171-181.

⁽⁴⁶⁾ According to Sasson, however, the second colon of the first line begins with *wayyā'ānēnī* (Jonah, 168).

⁽⁴⁷⁾ E is also linked to A in so far as only these two sections contain terms for the netherworld preceded by the preposition *min*: *mibbeten šē'ōl* in 3c, *miššaḥat* in 7d. The stanza that comes immediately after A (i.e., v. 4) opens with a verb beginning with *watta-* and closes with a 3rd pers. pl. verb ending in -ū, just as does the stanza immediately following E (i.e., vv. 8c-9b).

bicolon and the presence of the word-pair *hayyay // napšî*⁽⁴⁸⁾ ending the first colon of each.

The reader cannot fail to notice something strange about the sequence in the second part of the poem, E-F-G. The poet has placed 7de immediately after 7a-c to create a contrast between descent (*yāradtî*) and ascent (*watta'al*), between despair and deliverance. The effect is masterful, but this juxtaposition has created an unusual arrangement. No matter what division of the verses one subscribes to, the events are out of logical order. The expected sequence would be: threat from the forces of chaos, remembrance of Yahweh, prayer, deliverance, thanksgiving/sacrifice. This is what we find, for example, in Sirach 51, a hymn of thanksgiving which has a number of affinities with the Prayer of Jonah⁽⁴⁹⁾: threat from the forces of chaos (vv. 6b-7), remembrance of Yahweh's saving deeds (v. 8), prayer (v. 9), deliverance (vv. 11b-12a), thanksgiving (v. 12b)⁽⁵⁰⁾. But the progression in Jonah 2,7d-10 is rather: threat (4-7c), deliverance (7de), remembrance of Yahweh (8b), prayer (8cd), thanksgiving/sacrifice (10a-c). Here the thanksgiving element is at the end and prayer follows remembrance, as is expected. Clearly, it is the act of deliverance that is out of sequence.

This unusual arrangement has made possible an interesting correspondence of Part I of the prayer (B-C-D) with Part II (E-F-G). There is some disturbance of the sequence in Part I as well. Section C interrupts the description of the poet's being overwhelmed by the powers of chaos (in B and D), and specifically breaks the sequence of the seven watery elements listed in vv. 4.6ab. In section C, i.e., in the center of B-C-D, comes the phrase *hēkal qodšekā*, "your holy temple" (5d). Now Yahweh's temple, the pinnacle of cosmic order, is the diametrical opposite of chaos and the netherworld. Whereas the netherworld and its features represent danger and death, the temple stands for safety and life. Thus reference to the temple in the prayer is bounded on either side by the forces of chaos in B-C-D. The same is true of E-F. There too the temple (*hēkal qodšekā*, 8d) is surrounded by references to the powers of chaos — *miššahat* in v. 7d and, I would argue, *miššōm'erim*, etc. in v. 9. In E-F only these two words contain the preposition *min*.

⁽⁴⁸⁾ On this word-pair, see Ps 7,6 (noted by Y. AVISHUR, *Stylistic Studies of Word-Pairs in Biblical and Ancient Semitic Literatures* [AOAT 210; Kevelaer-Neukirchen-Vluyn 1984] 66). Other examples of the pair include Pss 26,9; 88,4; Job 9,21; Lam 3,58.

⁽⁴⁹⁾ SASSON, *Jonah*, 213, thinks that Sir 51,1-12 was based in part on the Prayer of Jonah.

⁽⁵⁰⁾ Cf. the sequence in Psalm 18: threat from the forces of chaos (vv. 4-6), prayer to Yahweh (v. 7), deliverance (v. 20), ... thanksgiving (vv. 50-51).

Stanza	Verse	Topic
B	4	Chaos (in the form of water)
C	5d	Temple (the psalmist speaks)
D	6a-7c	Chaos (in the form of water, netherworld)
E	7d	Chaos (in the form of the "pit")
F	8d	Temple (the psalmist prays)
	9	Chaos (in the form of the wicked/faithless).

The difference between the two sections is that chaos is still a mortal threat in B-C-D, whereas it has been overcome in E-F.

The prepositions *min* and *'el* play a similar structural role in the poem, a fact which also supports the interpretation of *mšmrym*, etc. developed here. Specifically, in A and again in E-F there is a parallel movement from *min* to *'el* and back to *min*, as follows:

Stanza	Verse	Preposition	
A	3a	<i>min</i>	<i>miššārā</i>
	3b	<i>'el</i>	<i>'el-yhwh</i>
	3c	<i>min</i>	<i>mibbeṭen še'ōl</i>
E-F	7d	<i>min</i>	<i>miššaḥat</i>
	8c	<i>'el</i>	<i>'ēlākā</i>
	9a	<i>min</i>	<i>miššôm^erīm</i> etc.

In each case *min* governs a noun that refers to the chaotic forces besetting the poet. The two middle occurrences (in 3c and 7d) specifically mention the netherworld, whereas in the two outer ones (in 3a and 9a) these powers appear in a "demythologized" form as human afflictions (distress and the wicked respectively). In A and E-F *min* appears in the first colon of the first and last bicola of the respective sections. Moreover, in both the object of *'el* is Yahweh⁽⁵¹⁾.

In ancient Near Eastern thought the forces of chaos are concretized not only in the figure of the netherworld but sometimes in evil human beings as well. Both Egyptian and Akkadian royal inscriptions mention "chaos" in the same breath with the wicked (either as foreign foes or miscreants in society)⁽⁵²⁾. In Sir 51,1-12 Ben Sira mentions deliverance from "death... the pit... the netherworld" (v. 2a) and then from

⁽⁵¹⁾ Note also the movement from *min* to *'el* in C: *minneged 'ēnēkā... 'el hēkal qodšekā*.

⁽⁵²⁾ For Mesopotamian parallels, see H. H. SCHMIDT, "Creation, Righteousness, and Salvation: 'Creation Theology' as the Broad Horizon of Biblical Theology", *Creation in the Old Testament* (ed. B. W. ANDERSON) (Issues in Religion and Theology 6; Philadelphia 1984) 104 (I am indebted to R. J. Clifford for this reference); for Egyptian parallels, see S. MORENZ, *Egyptian Religion* (Ithaca 1973) 114.

“slandorous tongue ... lying lips ... my attackers” (v. 2b); “from the depths of the belly of the netherworld” (v. 5a) and then “from malicious lips, slimy deceivers ... treacherous tongues” (vv. 5b-6)⁽⁵³⁾. Jonah’s statement that his prayer reached God *miššōm^erim hablē-šāw’* is thus none too different from the psalmist praying to God “out of the depths” (Ps 130,1) or “from the brink of the netherworld” (Ps 61,3)⁽⁵⁴⁾.

Conclusion

The interpretation of *mšmrym* in Jonah 2,9 yields significant results for understanding not only this verse but the overall structure of the Prayer of Jonah. The data presented above support the contention that the word is not to be parsed as a piel participle but as *mim* + qal participle. The two cola are related “synonymously”, so that v. 9b is virtually a relative clause paralleling 9a. The verse refers to faithless Israelites who have abandoned the covenant, contrasted with the poet’s trust (v. 8) and piety (v. 10), a realization of the powers of chaos from which Yahweh delivers the poet. Thus v. 9 is connected syntactically with v. 8, leaving v. 10 as an independent stanza. The poem as a whole breaks down into seven stanzas, the first and last three being almost identical in length, with a larger central unit. The major caesura in the poem comes in v. 7d with *watta’al*, reversing the downward movement of vv. 4a-7c.

St. Patrick’s Seminary
320 Middlefield Road
Menlo Park, CA 94025 USA

Michael L. BARRÉ, S. S.

⁽⁵³⁾ Translation taken from P.W. SKEHAN—A.A. DI LELLA, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira* (AB 39; New York 1987) 561.

⁽⁵⁴⁾ See M. DAHOOD, *Psalms II: 50-100* (AB 17; Garden City 1968) 83-84.

Zacchaeus Revisited Once More: A Story of Vindication or Conversion?

In a study published recently in this journal⁽¹⁾, Alan C. Mitchell advanced considerably the discussion of the Zacchaeus pericope (Luke 19,1-10), especially in his treatment of the likely allusions to the LXX and Jewish Hellenistic traditions regarding Rahab and Abraham. However, in the main thrust of this article, his argument that Zacchaeus' statement in 19,8 ("I give half my goods to the poor, etc.") is to be understood as a defense rather than a resolve, he is not convincing⁽²⁾.

First, Mitchell's interpretation of Zacchaeus' words has the toll collector simultaneously defending his innocence while admitting his guilt. In his own paraphrase of what he considers Zacchaeus' defense of his customary righteous actions, Mitchell says that the toll collector restores fourfold "anything he may have extorted from a person"⁽³⁾. The idea that a toll collector could defend his just behavior and, at the same time, admit to occasional lapses into extortion seems quite contradictory. The fact that Zacchaeus' fourfold restitution exceeds the requirements in LXX Lev 6,4 (MT 5,24) and Num 5,6-7 in no way resolves the contradiction. Surely "inadvertent extortion"⁽⁴⁾ is an oxymoron.

In his denial that the talk of salvation and saving the lost in 19,9-10 necessarily entails conversion from sin⁽⁵⁾, Mitchell fails to see the implication of the key, clearly parallel, passage in 5,32. Defending his table fellowship with toll collectors and sinners, Jesus describes himself with the metaphor of a physician and then says, "I have not come to call the righteous but sinners to repentance [*eis metanoian*, a Lucan addition]". A parallel saving of a toll collector in the context of table fellowship recurs in the Zacchaeus episode. How could the reader not understand it as another case of *metanoia*? When Mitchell later⁽⁶⁾ asserts that "the story is lacking all the links to sin and repentance", he begs the question, for the traditional reading of 19,8 is precisely that missing link.

⁽¹⁾ "Zacchaeus Revisited: Luke 19,8 as a Defense", *Bib* 71 (1990) 153-176.

⁽²⁾ The following argument leans heavily upon my earlier review of the literature on, and fresh solution to, the problems raised in this passage: D. HAMM, SJ, "Luke 19:8 Once Again: Does Zacchaeus Defend or Resolve?", *JBL* 107 (1988) 431-437.

⁽³⁾ "Zacchaeus Revisited", 153.

⁽⁴⁾ Mitchell's phrase ("Zacchaeus", 156, n.5). For a discussion of the LXX use of *sychothanein*, see HALL, "Luke 19:8 Once Again", 434.

⁽⁵⁾ "Zacchaeus Revisited", 159-160.

⁽⁶⁾ *Ibid.*, 160.

Granting that 5,27-32 and 15,1-32, the other lost-and-found episodes, are about repentance and conversion, Mitchell argues that 19,1-10 has important differences that leave room for another interpretation. I should like here to respond to four of his assertions in this matter and to show that the Zacchaeus episode has very much in common with those other episodes of sin and conversion (⁷).

(1) "Pharisees and scribes are not mentioned in the Zacchaeus story". Yet I submit that their presence is strongly implied and naturally assumed within the flow of Luke's narrative. At 18,8 the reader has heard a parable about a Pharisee and a toll collector, addressed to "those who were convinced of their own righteousness" — undoubtedly intended to indicate that the targets were present in the audience. On the Mount of Olives, in a scene in close narrative continuity with the Zacchaeus episode, we hear reference to "some of the Pharisees in the crowd" at 19,39. Given that all prior "murmuring" in the Third Gospel up to the Zacchaeus episode has issued from Pharisees in table fellowship settings (at 5,30 and 15,2), it is most natural for the implied reader to assume that the ones who murmur once again about Jesus' sharing hospitality are those same Pharisees.

(2) "Table fellowship appears only in the story about Levi". I submit that all three episodes deal with meal hospitality. In Luke 15, Jesus tells the three lost-and-found parables precisely to defend his practice of dining with sinners (15,2). And in the Zacchaeus story, the vocabulary clearly implies full meal hospitality: the word describing Zacchaeus' welcoming of Jesus in v. 6, *hypodechomai*, usually means to "receive" in the sense of giving the welcome of full hospitality (as in Luke 10,38 and Acts 17,7); and the complaint of the crowd about Jesus "lodging" with a sinner employs the verb *katalyein*, which, as at Luke 9,12, alludes idiomatically to "unharnessing the pack animals" (⁸) and implies the complete settling in that, in the Middle East, always includes a meal.

(3) "While both the Levi story and the application of the parables of chap. 16 mention *metanoia*, the Zacchaeus story does not". But that, of course, begs the very question: if Zacchaeus' words in v. 8 can be shown to be an expression of resolve, that in itself would be the note of conversion.

(4) "It talks about salvation (*sōtēria*, *sōsai*) which the other two blocks of material do not". But I submit that the other two blocks do indeed talk about salvation. In 5,31 Jesus calls himself a physician, *iatros*, which is surely a way of interpreting his table fellowship with toll collectors and sinners as an act of healing (throughout Luke-Acts an image of salvation). And as for the parables of Luke 15, the finding of the lost sheep is surely a matter of saving; and the father's reference to the returned runaway as "dead and come to life again" clearly refers to an event of *sōtēria*. Luke can describe similar realities without confining himself to redundant diction.

Thus, the parallels between the Zacchaeus account, the table fellowship at Levi's (5,27-32), and the material of 15,1-2 stand firm. The similarities

(⁷) The following quoted assertions are all from "Zacchaeus Revisited", 161.

(⁸) Thus BAGD, 414.

among the three episodes are the author's cues that he means the implied reader to read the third episode in the light of the first and second⁽⁹⁾.

In arguing that Luke can have something else in mind than repentance when he speaks of being son or daughter of Abraham, Mitchell refers to the bent woman of 13,10-17 and the figure of Lazarus (16,19-31) and asserts that neither of these stories, dealing with the effects of salvation, talks about repentance of and forgiveness of sins⁽¹⁰⁾. While this can be argued regarding the bent woman of Luke 13, the parable of Dives and Lazarus is another case entirely. The cutting edge of 16,19-31 is not the salvation of Lazarus but the damnation of Dives. Luke's main emphasis, after all, in the whole of chapter 16, is the proper use of wealth. And Jesus is presented as speaking this parable largely in response to the Pharisees, who are characterized in Luke 16,14 as "money-lovers", *philargyroi*. The example story that follows five verses later is about precisely such a money-lover, showing what happens to a rich man who refuses to "hear", that is, to be converted to repentance by, "Moses and the prophets" (e.g., Isa 58,7). Though the word *metanoia* does not occur in the parable, *failure* to repent from the abuse of wealth is very much the issue.

In searching for the background that illuminates the characterization of Zacchaeus as a "son of Abraham," Mitchell, acknowledging the work of J. Drury, and R.B. Roy, argues plausibly that Luke's account of Zacchaeus reflects the vocabulary and situation of the Rahab traditions in LXX Joshua 2 and Jas 2,25 and the Abraham traditions in Jas 2,21-23 and LXX Genesis 18. That the Jewish Hellenistic portrait of Abraham as model of hospitality is also part of the background makes good sense, as does N. Dahl's interpretation of Luke's use of the figure of Abraham as the faithful patriarch whose descendants divide over the messiahship of Jesus. None of this background, however, requires that Zacchaeus be understood as defending himself in Luke 19,8. Indeed, the same background is perfectly compatible with the understanding that Zacchaeus proves himself to be a true son of Abraham precisely through the "good work" of his hospitable response of *metanoia* when Jesus invites himself into the chief toll collector's home and life.

Quite correctly, it seems to me, Mitchell looks to the preaching of John the Baptist (3,1-20) for an understanding of how Luke wants the implied reader to understand the notion of "true children of Abraham". The first fourteen verses of this pericope do indeed "tie salvation to good works"⁽¹¹⁾ by linking the Isaian salvation oracle with the Q material of vv. 7-9 and the special Lucan material of vv. 10-14. The latter verses spell out concretely exactly what works will show Jews to be truly children of Abraham: sharing, just dealings, and avoiding extortion and false accusation. Mitchell proceeds to argue from that passage (Luke 3,1-14) that Zacchaeus proves himself to be such a son of Abraham in his "customary behavior" of almsgiving and restitution.

⁽⁹⁾ The parallels are laid out in a tabular scheme in HAMM, "Luke 19:8 Once Again", 436-437.

⁽¹⁰⁾ "Zacchaeus Revisited", 163, n. 22.

⁽¹¹⁾ *Ibid.*, 172.

The point of the present note is to argue, once again, that the data are open to another, more likely, interpretation. The Baptist is urging his audience to produce good fruits as evidence of repentance (*karpous axious tēs metanoias* [3,8]), and when people ask him to spell that out, John exhorts them to “stop collecting more than what is prescribed (v. 13)” and not to “practice extortion (*mēde sykophantēsēte*)” (v. 14)⁽¹²⁾. If Luke wants the reader to see Zacchaeus as an example of this way of being a child of Abraham, it makes more sense that the toll collector would be an example of the kind of *conversion* treated in 3,7-14 than that he would be an example of a just person who has no need of conversion (the kind of righteous person Jesus said he had not come to call, in Luke 5,32).

Zacchaeus shows himself to be a true son of Abraham in just the sort of conversion John the Baptist was calling for in Luke 3,10-14. In his conversion he shows himself to be, like Abraham, one who shows his righteousness in deeds of hospitality. Although Mitchell fails to demonstrate that the episode is a story of vindication, he has helped us to see that Luke tells the story of Zacchaeus’ conversion in language that evokes LXX, Hellenistic and Christian traditions about the hospitality of Abraham and Rahab.

Theology Department
Creighton University
Omaha, NE 68178 USA

Dennis HAMM, SJ

⁽¹²⁾ The very word used of Zacchaeus’ admission of extortion in 19,8, the only other instance of the word in the NT.

RES BIBLIOGRAPHICAE

Un nouveau Wellhausen?

Après son essai sur la Genèse (*Die Komposition der Vätergeschichte* [BWANT 57; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1984]), E. Blum aborde l'ensemble Exo-de-Nombres⁽¹⁾. Il reste fidèle à sa méthode et à ses présupposés, mais il sait adapter et nuancer quand cela s'avère nécessaire. Il n'y a donc pas de sources indépendantes et parallèles dans Ex-Nb, mais des « compositions » tardives qui ont rassemblé, retravaillé et agencé en des œuvres organiques des traditions ou des textes plus anciens. Les deux « compositions » sont KD (« die vor-priesterliche Komposition »), sous la mouvance du deutéronomiste, mais postérieure à son œuvre, et KP (« die priesterliche Komposition »), appartenant à l'école sacerdotale. Les deux parties de ces « études » sont consacrées à ces deux « compositions ».

Les résultats principaux des analyses fouillées de E. B. ne se laissent pas facilement résumer. Nous en donnerons donc un aperçu qui pourra paraître arbitraire. Son premier but est d'indiquer la direction suivie par la recherche. Dans les textes présacerdotaux (KD) d'Ex 1-14(15), E. B. reconnaît la main des « compositeurs » surtout dans les passages suivants: Ex 3,1-4,18 (considéré comme une unité mises à part quelques très brèves additions); 11,1-3; 12,21-27; 13,3-16; 14,13-14.30-31. Ces textes ne forment pas en eux-mêmes un ensemble homogène et ils diffèrent par leur genèse et leur fonction. 12,21-27; 13,3-16 sont des additions liturgiques. Ex 5,22-23; 6,1; 14,13-14.30-31 sont des textes retravaillés pour correspondre aux intentions de KD. Ex 3,1-4,18 est une composition originale qui s'appuie sur des éléments plus anciens⁽²⁾.

Dans la péricope du Sinaï, KD se retrouve principalement dans des textes comme Ex 19,3b-8; 20,22; 24,3-8⁽³⁾. Ce dernier passage, très difficile, est un texte préexistant remanié par KD puis soudé à une autre tradition ancienne (24,1*.9-11) par les vv. 1-2. Par la suite, il faut attribuer à cette même composition 24,12-15a.18b (l'ellipse qui sépare 24,11 de 24,12 s'expli-

⁽¹⁾ E. BLUM, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch* (BZAW 189). Berlin-New York, W. de Gruyter, 1990. 433 p. 16 × 23. DM 148,—.

⁽²⁾ L'unité d'Ex 3,1-4,18 (mis à part 3,15; 4,13-16*) peut trouver une confirmation dans des travaux qui utilisent une méthode différente (*close reading*). Cf. J. MAGONET, « The Bush That Never Burnt », *HeyJ* 16 (1975) 304-311 (à propos des appellations divines); G. FISCHER, *Jahwe, unser Gott* (OBO 91; Fribourg-Göttingen 1989) 41-44 (sur le double *wayyō'mer*) et *passim* pour d'autres traits stylistiques.

⁽³⁾ Le sacerdoce promis à tout le peuple (Ex 19,6) lui sera conféré lors des rites d'Ex 24,3-8. Mais le peuple perdra ce privilège par l'apostasie d'Ex 32. Cela conduira à l'institution d'un sacerdoce lévitique (cf. 32,27-29).

que par l'insertion de 24,9-11); 32,7-14 (qui a dû prendre la place d'un texte antérieur). Ex 33-34 portent la marque de la même main en plus d'un endroit, mais il est presque impossible de séparer tradition et composition. Cette dernière s'est souvent contentée de donner une nouvelle orientation ou une nouvelle empreinte aux textes existants. En prenant comme texte de base Ex 32,7-14, E. B. trace les principales lignes de ce travail: la promesse faite aux pères (32,13; 33,1); Israël est-il peuple de YHWH ou peuple de Moïse? (32,7.11-12; 33,1.13...); Moïse comme intercesseur (32,10; 33,11.17...); l'expression «peuple à la nuque raide» (?); 32,9; 33,5; 34,9; le verbe *klh* (32,10.12; 33,5). A cette composition appartient en outre une série de textes où plusieurs thèmes se recoupent assez régulièrement pour former à chaque fois des arrangements différents. Ces thèmes sont la tente de la réunion, la descente de YHWH dans la colonne de nuée, l'intimité de Moïse avec Dieu («face-à-face»), Moïse et les prophètes, et Josué, serviteur et successeur de Moïse. Ils se retrouvent principalement en Ex 33 et 34; Nb 11 (la couche qui parle des «Anciens»); 12; Dt 31,14-15.23; 34,10(-12).

Les articulations de la composition générale sont visibles à certains endroits comme Gn 50,24 et Ex 3,16.17 ou Ex 1,6.8 et Jg 2,8a.10. C'est à KD que nous devons les textes sur la promesse qui relie la Genèse à l'Exode (Gn 15; 22,15-18; 24,7; 26,3bβ-5.24*; Ex 13,5.11; 32,13; 33,1; Nb 11,12 [Dt 31,23]; 14,16.23). De même, le thème de la foi et de la vision lui est propre (Gn 15,6; Ex 4,1-9.31; 14,31; 19,9; Nb 14,11.22; Ex 34,10; 33,16). Enfin, E. B. mentionne les textes sur la tente de la réunion (Ex 33-34; Nb 11; Dt 31; 34). Cette composition débute avec Abraham. Elle ne connaît pas l'histoire des origines. Il faut donc abandonner la théorie du kérygme du Yahviste en Gn 12,1-3. D'autre part, KD suppose déjà l'existence de DtrG qu'elle fait précéder d'une histoire du salut. Les deux sont reliés dans les derniers chapitres du Deutéronome. La fin de KD coïncide avec la mort de Moïse (Dt 34). Cette conclusion est cependant ouverte. Elle n'exclut pas, au contraire, la suite de l'histoire jusqu'à l'exil. Les rapports entre KD et Dt sont complexes selon E. B. En prenant Ex 32-34 (cf. Dt 9,7-10,11) et Nb 13-14 (cf. Dt 1,19-46) comme exemples, E. B. montre que KD connaît à la fois les textes anciens et la version deutéronomique des faits. Elle retravaille les textes anciens en fonction du Deutéronome. L'exégèse doit donc discerner les trois voix de cette œuvre pour pouvoir l'interpréter correctement. Ceux qui n'ont perçu que deux voix (textes anciens et interprétation deutéronomique) n'ont pas rendu justice à toutes les harmoniques des textes en question (cf. surtout D. E. Skweres). En ce qui concerne la date, KD est à situer à l'époque de la première génération du retour. Les deux fondements pour construire le futur d'Israël sont les promesses faites aux patriarches et l'exode. Cependant, il faut remarquer qu'un texte comme Ex 3-4 ne mentionne nullement les promesses faites aux patriarches. L'exode est à considérer comme un nouveau commencement et Ex 32 comme une sorte de péché originel du peuple après l'alliance d'Ex 24. Sans nier les connexions entre promesses patriarcales et exode, E. B. insiste aussi sur la distinction des deux blocs. Cette composition n'offre pas à ses destinataires un passé idéalisé (protologie; cf. les murmures dans le désert). Elle ne projette pas non plus le salut uniquement dans le futur (eschatologie). Un texte comme Ex 19,3-8

s'adresse à chaque génération comme possibilité toujours offerte. Enfin, comme DtrG, KD situe les prophètes dans le sillage de Moïse. Toutefois, elle suggère aussi la possibilité d'une rivalité et d'une prééminence de Moïse par rapport au prophétisme (Nb 11-12). Ce complexe se définit enfin comme «Tora» et non comme œuvre historique ou purement narrative. Les rapports entre histoire et loi sont aux mieux définis par Dt 6,20-25. La loi se fonde sur l'histoire et l'histoire conduit à la réponse décrite par la Tora. Dans un appendice (208-218), E. B. énonce quelques-unes de ses conclusions sur les rapports entre tradition et composition. Il spécifie (1) qu'on ne trouve pas dans Ex-Nb de «grandes unités» (selon la théorie de R. Rendtorff), sauf en ce qui concerne l'histoire de Balaam. (2) La tradition antérieure à KD connaissait donc un long texte qui commençait avec l'exode et finissait sans doute avec la mort de Moïse. Mais ce dernier point est moins sûr. Cette tradition date très probablement de la chute de Samarie (après 722).

La composition sacerdotale n'est ni une rédaction ni une source. E. B. illustre cette nouvelle thèse (cf. *Die Komposition*, 424-432) à partir de six exemples (Ex 6-7; le récit des plaies⁽⁴⁾; le miracle de la mer; Nb 16; 20,1-13; l'histoire des origines). KP suppose les traditions anciennes connues. Par exemple, elle n'introduit pas Moïse (Ex 6,2), fait difficilement compréhensible pour un personnage de cette taille. D'un autre côté, elle donne l'impression d'offrir à certaines occasions une version indépendante et parallèle. Ainsi, Ex 6-7 ne contient aucune référence explicite à Ex 3-4. La pierre angulaire de cet édifice est le désir du Créateur de trouver une communauté. E. B. parle de *Gottesnähe* («proximité de Dieu» ou «intimité de Dieu» avec l'humanité). Cette communion existait à l'origine, mais elle a été détruite au temps du déluge. Elle sera partiellement restaurée dans l'histoire d'Israël. Dans ce but, Dieu installe son sanctuaire au milieu de son peuple (Ex 25-40); il institue le service liturgique (Lv 1-10); il consacre son peuple et promulgue les lois de pureté et de sainteté (Lv 11-26); enfin, il sanctifie le camp (Nb 1-10). A ce propos, il est à noter qu'E. B. conteste que la Loi de Sainteté ait existé comme document indépendant.

La composition de la Loi dans son état actuel date de l'époque perse. E. B. voit dans le Pentateuque un document analogue aux «autorisation impériales» (*Reichsautorisation*) de l'empire perse qui fixaient le statut politique de certaines régions plus ou moins autonomes. Il s'appuie surtout sur les travaux de P. Frei pour étayer sa thèse⁽⁵⁾. La composition finale s'explique par la présence de deux groupes dominants à l'intérieur de la communauté du second temple (les propriétaires terriens de Juda et le clergé de Jérusalem) qui furent obligés par les circonstances à s'entendre. C'est pourquoi le Pentateuque est le résultat, en quelque sorte, d'un compromis entre

⁽⁴⁾ Il est à noter qu'E. B. attribue à KP Ex 9,22-23aa*.35; 10,12.13aa*.14aa.20; 10,21-23.27. E. B. nie l'existence de l'élohiste auquel ces versets appartiennent pour beaucoup d'auteurs.

⁽⁵⁾ P. FREI, «Zentralgewalt und Lokalaautonomie im Achämenidenreich», *Reichsidee und Reichorganisation im Perserreich* (Hrsg. K. KOCH-P. FREI) (OBO 55; Fribourg-Göttingen 1984) 7-43.

Tableau récapitulatif des principaux textes

	Textes KD	Textes KP	Textes postérieurs
Ex	1,6.8 3,1-4,18* (3,16-17) 4,30-31 5,22-6,1 11,1-3 12,21-27 13,5.6-16 14,13-14.30-31 19,3b-8.9 20,22 24,3-8.12-15a.18b 32,7-14 33,1.5.11.13.16.17... 34,9.10...	1,1-5.7.13-14 2,23aβ-25 6,2-12.29-7,13 7,19-20αα.21b-22 8,1-3.11* 8,12-15 9,8-12 9,22-23αα*.35 10,12.13αα*.14αα.20 10,21-23.27 14,1-4.7-8.10bβ.15-18. 21ααβ*. 22-23.26. 27αα*.28-29 15,19 16,1-3.6-7.9-27.30. 33-35a 20,11 24,1*.9* 25-31 31,18 32,15-16 34,29-35 35-40	4,13-16.21-23.27-28 6,14-27 13,19 14,19a 15,25b-26(27) 16,4-5.[8].28-29.31-32. [35b-36] 18,1-12.13-27 23,10-33* 32,34aβ 33,2.3b*.4 34,11-27(28a)
Lv		1-10.11-26	
Nb	11* 12* 14,11-25	1-10 13,1-17a.21.25.26*.32 14,1-10.26-38 16-17 20,1-13	
Dt	31,14-15.23 34,10(-12)		
Jos			24,32
Jg	2,8a.10		2,1-5

deux tendances diverses (KD et KP). Les dernières pages abordent le problème de la forme finale (*Endgestalt*) du Pentateuque. Quelques textes ont été ajoutés à la suite de ce «compromis historique» de l'époque perse (cf. certaines parties d'Ex 16; 15,25b-26[27]; 18; voir aussi Ex 4,16-17.27-28). Il faut aussi ajouter une rédaction qui tourne autour de Jos 24 (Gn 33,19; 35,1-7; 50,25.26b; Ex 13,19; Jos 24,32) et une série de textes qui mentionnent l'ange de Dieu (Ex 14,19a; 23,20-33*; [32,34aβ] 33,2.3b*.4; 34,11-27; Jg 2,1-5). Enfin, il n'existe pas de «forme finale», mais un ensemble complexe qui ne peut être le produit d'une seule intention. Cette forme finale n'est qu'un postulat nécessaire, jamais un but que la recherche puisse atteindre.

Ce résumé, malgré sa longueur, n'épuise en rien la richesse de cette thèse. Si les titres choisis par E. B. font écho à l'œuvre de J. Wellhausen, ce n'est sans doute pas un simple hasard. Comme Wellhausen, E. B. se refuse à quitter le terrain de l'écrit pour s'aventurer dans le domaine de la tradition orale. Les textes ont une préhistoire, mais elle nous reste scellée. Par ailleurs, E. B. se sépare, toujours parce qu'il veut respecter l'écrit dans toute sa complexité, de l'école de la *Redaktionsgeschichte* et de quelques tendances de la «nouvelle critique du Pentateuque» (cf. surtout 213-215). Il est possible de distinguer «tradition» et «composition», il est plus rarement possible de soustraire l'une de l'autre. Sur un autre front, E. B. ne se montre pas autrement enthousiaste vis-à-vis des études synchroniques ou des approches purement littéraires des textes bibliques (256; 283, n.208; 380-381). Il sait se servir de leurs résultats, cependant, comme il le fit dans son travail sur la Genèse (pour Ex-Nb, cf. par exemple 9, n.3; 242-243; 261, n.123). Ceci n'est pas tellement fréquent outre-Rhin. Enfin, tout en reprenant bien des observations de ceux qui datent le Jahwiste de l'époque postexilique, E. B. reste fidèle à une histoire littéraire d'Israël plus classique, mais sous une forme modifiée: anciennes traditions, D, DtrG, KD, KP, derniers ajouts rédactionnels (208-218; discussion avec M. Rose et J. Van Seters). Pour les derniers ajouts, cf. 164, n.275; 361-377.

L'idée centrale de cette thèse, celle de deux compositions principales dans le Pentateuque, est séduisante à plus d'un égard. Une confirmation de cette idée pourrait venir d'une étude des résumés de l'histoire d'Israël à l'intérieur du Pentateuque. On les retrouve dans le Deutéronome et l'œuvre deutéronomiste. Il s'agit des fameux «petits credos historiques» (cf. Dt 6,20-25; 26,5-10; voir aussi Jos 24,2-13; 1 S 12,7-8[9-12]). Mais il en existe un aussi dans l'œuvre sacerdotale (Ex 6,2-8). Ces «récits dans le récit» montrent à l'évidence que les réflexions sur l'ensemble de l'histoire d'Israël coïncident avec ces deux compositions. Il n'y a rien de semblable ailleurs dans le Pentateuque. Cependant, plusieurs différences séparent les «credos» deutéronomiques/deutéronomistes du «credo» sacerdotal. Tout d'abord, l'alliance du Sinaï devient un des actes de Dieu en faveur de son peuple uniquement pour KP (Ex 6,7). Si, contrairement à ce qu'on a pu penser, le Dt n'exclut pas le Sinaï (ou l'Horeb) de l'histoire du salut, il voit d'abord dans cet événement un appel constant à la réponse d'Israël. C'est pourquoi il ne fait pas partie de la «geste divine» ni du texte du «credo». KP, par contre, met l'accent sur l'initiative divine dans ce cas précis. En fait, pour

KP, la réponse est différente. Il s'agit plutôt de la sanctification du peuple et du culte.

En outre, les textes situent la narration de l'histoire du salut dans des milieux différents. Souvent, le récit des *mirabilia Dei* est une réponse à la «question du fils» (Ex 12,26; 13,8.14; Dt 6,20; Jos 4,6.21). Le récit peut avoir un cadre cultuel (Dt 26,2-3) ou bien être proclamé par un personnage important dans des circonstances particulières (Jos 24; 1 S 12). Il est à noter cependant que tous les narrateurs sont des personnages humains. La plupart du temps, il s'agit du destinataire du récit premier qui s'adresse à lui à la seconde personne («lorsque *ton* fils..., *tu* diras...»). Le récit est en quelque sorte confié à tous les auditeurs du Deutéronome qui se transmet ainsi de génération en génération. Le récit assure lui-même sa propre postérité. Il n'en va pas ainsi dans le texte sacerdotal. Le récit est révélé par Dieu, qui en est le premier narrateur, à Moïse seul. Ce dernier le transmettra à son tour à Israël, du moins en partie (cf. Ex 6,2.6). On observera que la partie destinée au peuple concerne l'exode (6,6-8; le serment conclu avec les patriarches est-il supposé connu?). Faut-il y voir une sorte d'exclusivisme? Il est certain que KP souligne l'origine divine du «récit» comme tel, confié en dépôt à un personnage et, très probablement, aux institutions qu'il représente. Tout ceci va dans le sens de la thèse de E.B. et pourrait même corroborer son opinion sur l'origine différente de KD et KP (milieu plus laïc pour KD et plus sacré pour KP).

Si l'on aborde l'ensemble de la théorie de KD, il reste une difficulté à résoudre, pensons-nous. Elle n'est certainement pas insurmontable. D'une part, c'est KD qui fait le lien entre les promesses patriarcales et l'exode (cf. 103-104 et *passim*). D'autre part, l'histoire patriarcale et l'exode restent deux thèmes séparés, même pour KD (cf. Ex 3-4; 189-190 et n.396-397). Comment réconcilier ces deux affirmations? Pourquoi, en particulier, KD n'a-t-il pas voulu introduire le thème des promesses de la Genèse en Ex 3-4? Pourquoi est-ce Moïse qui les mentionne le plus souvent dans son intercession (Ex 32,13; cf. Nb 14,16)? YHWH se souvient rarement de ses promesses dans cette composition (Ex 33,1 [qui reprend 32,13]; Dt 31,23; cf. 190, n.397). L'exégète peut se poser quelques questions à ce propos. Dans une lecture synchronique, il peut se demander comment Moïse connaît ces promesses. Qui en a parlé à Moïse avant Ex 32? Et pourquoi Moïse a-t-il une meilleure mémoire que YHWH? Quelle est la logique interne du récit KD à ce propos? D'un point de vue moins immanent, le critique peut aussi s'interroger sur l'origine du motif et sur la raison de sa présence dans l'histoire du veau d'or. La signification de Moïse et de son héritage dans la tradition d'Israël prennent un relief particulier dans ce passage⁽⁶⁾. Le rappel des promesses dans le récit de l'exode doit-il se comprendre dans le cadre de la première apostasie d'Israël? En d'autres termes, l'exode et les promesses patriarcales n'ont-ils été joints qu'en temps de crise (cf. Nb 14)? La théologie des promesses permettrait, en quelque sorte, de sauver Israël (et l'exode).

⁽⁶⁾ Cf. par exemple E. AURELIUS, *Der Fürbitter Israels. Eine Studie zum Mosebild im Alten Testament* (ConB OT 27; Stockholm 1988) 97-99.

M. Rose a proposé une théorie très semblable, même si ses conclusions, surtout quant à la datation des sources, ne sont pas identiques⁽⁷⁾.

E. B. (190) explique la chose en disant que l'exode est considéré comme un nouveau commencement, à côté des promesses patriarcales. Les deux thèmes ne sont pas en concurrence. D'autre part l'exode n'est pas une conséquence des promesses patriarcales⁽⁸⁾. Ne pourrait-on trouver une certaine confirmation dans les différences qui séparent les récits de Gn et Ex-Nb? Les traditions patriarcales sont très proches des récits populaires. Il n'est pas étonnant que la plupart des exégètes sensibles à l'art narratif de la Bible aient davantage étudié la Genèse que l'Exode (cf. déjà H. Gunkel). Narrateur, narrataire, événements et personnages appartiennent au même univers. Avec l'exode s'instaure une distance esthétique et critique. Le récit devient un écrit qui apparaît dans le récit lui-même (Ex 24,3-8; Dt 17,18; 31,9-14.24-29; cf. Jos 8,30-35; 24,26-27). La réponse du peuple est spécifiée. Le livre le met devant un choix existentiel (cf. les bénédictions et les malédictions). N'y aurait-il pas là comme une référence implicite à deux identités d'Israël, deux façons d'établir la solidarité d'un peuple? D'une part, l'histoire patriarcale insiste sur les liens du sang avec tout ce que cela signifie pour une société antique. D'autre part, la tradition de l'exode met l'accent sur la liberté et le choix (devant la «Tora»). La structure narrative différente et le passage d'une narration simple à une narration réflexive, avec l'apparition de l'écrit dans la narration elle-même, va plutôt dans ce sens. KD d'abord, KP ensuite (cf. Ex 6,2-8; Lv 26) montrent aussi comment ces deux théologies dialoguent. Les échecs de l'aventure de la liberté obligent à renouer avec le monde patriarcal qui précède, dans la narration, les choix existentiels. L'époque des patriarches apparaît aussi comme le temps de l'innocence et d'une relation inconditionnelle avec YHWH (204-205).

A propos de KP, E. B. propose comme thème central la *Gottesnähe*. Il écarte d'autres problématiques, comme celle de la structure d'un écrit sacerdotal indépendant (loi ou histoire; cf. N. Lohfink) ou celle de la terre, liée à une date exilique (voir 288, n. 5). E. B. place KP à l'époque perse (cf. Wellhausen). Cette nouvelle accentuation fait pencher la balance dans un sens. Si le ténor de la thèse nous paraît juste, peut-être faudrait-il y ajouter quelques dièses pour obtenir une harmonie plus complète. Ainsi, le thème de la terre n'est sans doute pas essentiel (comme c'est le cas pour KD; cf. 191). Il ne se retrouve guère dans la législation du Lévitique, par exemple. Mais ne s'agirait-il pas d'une sorte de *basso continuo*, pour rester fidèle à l'image musicale? Des textes aussi importants que Gn 17,8; 35,12; Ex 6,3.8⁽⁹⁾; Nb

⁽⁷⁾ M. ROSE, *Deuteronomist und Jahwist. Berührungspunkte beider Literaturwerke* (ATANT 67; Zürich 1981). Discussion d'E. B.: p. 209-211.

⁽⁸⁾ Récemment, T. Römer a été encore plus loin en affirmant que les «pères» qui sont si souvent cités dans le Dt ne sont pas les patriarches, sauf dans quelques ajouts tardifs (T. RÖMER, *Israels Väter* [OBO 99; Fribourg-Göttingen 1990]).

⁽⁹⁾ Il ne nous semble pas possible de nier l'appartenance d'Ex 6,8 à P. Cf. par exemple F. KOHATA, *Jahwist und Priesterschrift in Ex 3-14* (BZAW 166; Berlin-New York 1986) 29-34, avec bibliographie. Mais la ressemblance d'Ex 6,2-8 avec Ez (surtout Ez 20) parle plutôt en faveur de la thèse inverse. Le mot *môrāšā* se trouve en Ez 11,15; 25,4.10; 33,24; 36,2.3.5. Pour l'expression *nš' 'et-yād* comme expression d'un

14,30-33; 20,12 sont centrés sur la terre. Le premier grand péché d'Israël dans le désert, selon KP, est la « calomnie de la terre » (*dibbat hā'āreš*; Nb 13,32; 14,36-37)⁽¹⁰⁾. Elle n'est pas non plus absente des préoccupations dans certaines lois du Lévitique (c.25). Elle n'appartient qu'à YHWH (25,23). Lv 25,38 cite dans un même souffle comme buts de l'exode le don de la terre et la volonté de YHWH de devenir Dieu d'Israël. Enfin, Lv 26,42 (cf. 43-45) met grammaticalement sur le même pied le fait que YHWH promet de se souvenir de sa *b'erūt* avec les trois patriarches et de la terre (*wehā'āreš 'ezkōr*). Il ne faut sans doute pas presser l'argument outre mesure, mais il n'en reste pas moins un élément de poids. La terre semble devoir être le lieu privilégié de la *Gottesnähe*.

Toujours à propos de KP, on peut se demander, tout comme E. B. d'ailleurs, s'il n'est pas possible d'y voir plusieurs couches. Pour ne prendre qu'un exemple, il n'est pas facile, à nos yeux, de voir comment Ex 12,1-14,28 s'intègre dans KP. Les obstacles sont assez nombreux et peuvent contrebalancer les arguments usuels tirés du vocabulaire et du caractère liturgique de cette page. Les premières difficultés sont causées par l'insertion du passage dans l'ensemble du récit sacerdotal. Ex 7,1-5 ne parle pas de la mort des premiers-nés. On peut répliquer que les instructions sur la Pâque sont d'un type différent et ne sont pas nécessairement liées à la mort des premiers-nés (cf. cependant Ex 12,12). Ou encore dire qu'Ex 7,1-5 parle des événements de façon globale. Par ailleurs, M. Noth avait déjà remarqué que si Ex 14 est le sommet du récit de la sortie d'Égypte et si la Pâque en est la célébration liturgique, elle devrait plutôt se situer après Ex 14⁽¹¹⁾. En outre, l'introduction du chapitre est étrange. Pourquoi mentionner la terre d'Égypte (12,1)? Le lecteur sait depuis longtemps que la scène se déroule en Égypte (cf. Ex 6,28). La nature du texte explique-t-elle cette redondance? Ex 12 insiste-t-il sur le fait que la première Pâque fut célébrée en terre d'esclavage? Si Ex 12,12 contient un vocabulaire proche d'Ex 6,6; 7,4 (le mot *šepāṭīm*), l'expression n'est pas la même (*āšā šepāṭīm b'e*, 12,12; *šepāṭīm gedōlīm*, 6,6; 7,4). En outre, Ex 12,12 introduit un thème tout à fait inconnu de P, les « dieux de l'Égypte ».

serment divin, voir surtout Ez 20,28.42. Ces versets parlent d'un serment divin à propos de l'entrée dans la terre dans un vocabulaire identique à celui d'Ex 6,8. Ce dernier verset est donc, comme bien d'autres, en relation avec Ez 20. Par contre, Ex 6,2-8 n'utilise pas le verbe *šb*, propre à la tradition deutéronomique/deutéronomiste, à laquelle on voudrait attribuer Ex 6,8. Dire que P ne s'intéresse pas à l'entrée dans la terre (ou ne peut s'intéresser à la terre) ne tient pas compte de tous les textes, me semble-t-il. Si Ex 6,8 contient un vocabulaire propre, peu connu de P, il en va de même d'Ex 6,6 (*yš' [hif.] mittahat siblōt mišrayim*; verbes *nšl* et *g'l*).

⁽¹⁰⁾ Cf. N. LOHFINK, «Die Ursünden in der priesterlichen Geschichtserzählung», *Die Zeit Jesu* (FS. H. Schlier; [Hrsg. G. BORNKAMM-K. RAHNER] Freiburg 1970) 38-57 = *Studien zum Pentateuch* (SBAB 4; Stuttgart 1988) 169-189.

⁽¹¹⁾ M. NOTH, *Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch* (Stuttgart 1948) 70-77. Voir aussi B. S. CHILDS, *Exodus* (OTL; London-Philadelphia 1974) 189-195, pour lequel Ex 12 est une parenthèse entre le récit des plaies et le passage de la mer, fortement unifiés dans le récit sacerdotal. E. B. reconnaît aussi qu'après le « point d'orgue » d'Ex 11,9-10, le récit ne reprend qu'avec Ex 12,29 après une sorte d'« accord de septième » (255).

D'autres objections surgissent lorsque l'on compare Ex 12 avec les principaux textes liturgiques propres à KP. Ces textes ont tous comme cadre une théophanie (Gn 17,1 [circoncision]; Ex 16,7.10 [sabbat]; Ex 24,16-18 [construction de la tente]; Lv 9,4.6.23 [inauguration du culte]). Ex 12 fait exception. De plus, ces textes comportent normalement une partie narrative à côté des discours divins. A nouveau, Ex 12 fait exception, car il ne contient qu'une formule d'exécution (v. 28).

Enfin, on peut se demander si KP peut parler d'un vrai culte avant le Sinaï. Cette objection est plus théologique, mais elle n'en a pas moins sa valeur. Il n'existe pas encore, à proprement parler, d'assemblée sacrée ni de tente (cf. Ex 29,42-43; Lv 9). De plus, la « gloire de YHWH » ne s'est pas encore manifestée (Ex 14,4.17-18) et elle semble essentielle au culte (Ex 29,43; 40,34). Si Gn 17 et Ex 16 précèdent la théophanie du Sinaï, c'est parce que ces textes traitent des pratiques d'Israël qui ne requièrent pas de sanctuaire ni d'institutions cultuelles (la circoncision et le sabbat). Enfin, dernière difficulté: KP contient deux textes sur la Pâque (Ex 12 et Lv 23). Comment l'expliquer? Plusieurs possibilités s'offrent à l'esprit et plus d'une est certainement conciliable avec l'opinion d'E. B. Nous avons d'abord voulu signaler la présence d'un problème⁽¹²⁾.

Dans son exégèse de Nb 20,1-13 (271-278), E. B. propose une thèse originale. Le péché de Moïse et d'Aaron serait avant tout d'avoir imité aveuglément le scénario d'Ex 17,1-7 sans prendre garde à la nouveauté de la situation et à l'ordre de YHWH. Dans le même sens, un lecteur attentif remarquera que Moïse porte la plainte du peuple devant YHWH en Ex 17,4. Par contre, Moïse et Aaron font de l'incident une affaire personnelle en Nb 20,10. Ils ne semblent pas percevoir de façon claire que la « querelle » (*rîb*) touche d'abord YHWH (cf. Ex 17,7; Nb 20,13).

Le lien entre le Pentateuque et l'« autorisation impériale » à l'époque perse ne manque pas d'intérêt non plus. Il reste cependant quelques difficultés à résoudre, semble-t-il, même si elles ne sont pas insurmontables. Les autorités perses n'ont-elles pas dû sourciller à la lecture (si lecture il y a eu!) de textes comme Gn 15,18 (appartenant à KD, selon E. B.)? Que penser de textes sacerdotaux comme Gn 17,4-6; 35,11? De plus, le Pentateuque n'est pas entièrement pacifique (ni pacifiste). On pense par exemple à Ex 17,8-16; Nb 10,35-36; 21,1-3.10-35; 23,24; 24,8-9.17-24; 31-32; Dt 20 (cf. 380, n. 71; cette remarque me vient d'une conversation avec N. Lohfink). Ces textes n'ont-ils pas pu inquiéter un empire soucieux de stabilité? Ils ne vont pas exactement dans le sens des réflexions de F. Crüsemann, par exemple, sur lesquelles E. B. s'appuie en partie⁽¹³⁾. Cela ne signifie nullement qu'il faille abandonner l'idée. Il sera peut-être nécessaire de la nuancer (cf. déjà 360, n. 96). Le document présenté aux autorités perses était-il uniquement législatif? Faut-il distinguer, comme R. Rendtorff, deux documents, l'un plus

⁽¹²⁾ Cf. J. L. SKA, « Les plaies d'Égypte dans le récit sacerdotal (P*) », *Bib* 60 (1979) 23-35.

⁽¹³⁾ F. CRÜSEMANN, « Le Pentateuque, une Tora », *Le Pentateuque en question* (éd. A. DE PURY) (Neuchâtel 1989) 339-360, surtout 359-360: « Ce document juridique comme tel ne pouvait en aucune façon contenir un récit de la conquête violente des principales provinces voisines et de leur partage à Israël ».

juridique (Esd 7) et l'autre plus « liturgique » (Ne 9)⁽¹⁴⁾? Les « autorisations impériales » connues sont d'ordre législatif et contiennent peu de parties narratives. Faut-il penser que la rédaction du Pentateuque serait plutôt une conséquence de l'autorisation impériale? Il a fallu que tous s'unissent pour pouvoir reconstruire la nation et le temple. D'autre part, la volonté de renouer avec le passé après le drame de l'exil pourrait expliquer le désir de recueillir et de réactualiser les documents anciens sans rien en perdre. Même s'il reste l'un ou l'autre point obscur, l'idée proposée par E. B. est certainement fructueuse.

Une dernière réflexion à propos de la méthode choisie vient de la lecture des quelques pages consacrée par E. B. aux études de type synchronique et littéraire (au sens propre; 380-382). Loin de nous de nier la légitimité, ni même la nécessité de la méthode historico-critique. Une vraie lecture synchronique ne peut qu'y mener, à notre avis, si elle est faite de manière clairvoyante et rigoureuse. M. Sternberg lui-même, qu'on ne peut soupçonner d'être un fanatique de l'exégèse classique, défend ce point de vue⁽¹⁵⁾. L'exégète devrait aussi souscrire sans trop de problèmes à une autre remarque critique d'E. B. lorsqu'il dit qu'il est difficile d'analyser les textes bibliques selon les catégories applicables aux œuvres de fiction modernes (cf. les théories des « œuvres d'art autonomes »). Toutefois, il est peut-être possible d'envisager le problème sous un autre angle. Des critiques littéraires dont on ne peut mettre la compétence en doute ont pu montrer que la Bible a influencé toute la littérature occidentale. Elle n'en est pas l'unique source (l'autre source importante étant la littérature grecque et latine). Il suffira de citer le noms d'E. Auerbach, R. Scholes et R. Kellogg, et N. Frye⁽¹⁶⁾. L'étude littéraire de la Bible permet de reconnaître l'origine de certains procédés et de certaines techniques. Mais elle fait aussi apparaître les différences. Son premier but est d'analyser les textes selon leurs propres critères, la plupart immanents aux textes eux-mêmes. Ceci rejoint d'ailleurs une des préoccupations constantes d'E. B. qui refuse d'imposer aux textes une logique qui n'est pas la leur⁽¹⁷⁾. Enfin, il est certain que la réponse (dans le sens que lui donne la *Reader-Response Criticism*) qu'attendent les textes bibliques est différente de la réponse esthétique des romans de fiction. La Bible n'offre pas à son lecteur virtuel une vision de la réalité parmi d'autres, mais un choix dont l'enjeu final est la survie de tout Israël. Le texte trace lui-même l'itinéraire de son lecteur virtuel, appelé à se reconnaître dans l'Israël intradiégétique, spécialement lorsque ce texte fait allusion explicite aux généra-

⁽¹⁴⁾ R. RENDTORFF, « Esra und das 'Gesetz' », *ZAW* 96 (1984) 373-385.

⁽¹⁵⁾ M. STERNBERG, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative* (Bloomington 1985) 1-57. Cf. entre autres son insistance sur la dimension historique des narrations bibliques.

⁽¹⁶⁾ E. AUERBACH, *Mimesis. Dargestellte Wirklichkeit in der abendländischen Literatur* (Bern 1946; 21959); R. SCHOLES-R. KELLOGG, *The Nature of Narrative* (New York 1966); N. FRYE, *The Great Code. The Bible and Literature* (London-New York 1982). Voir aussi à ce sujet: S. LIPTZIN, *Biblical Themes in World Literature* (Hoboken, NJ 1985). A propos de la « fiction », cf. M. OEMING, « Bedeutung und Funktionen von »Fiktionen« in der alttestamentlichen Geschichtsschreibung », *EvTh* 44 (1984) 254-266.

⁽¹⁷⁾ Par exemple 75, n. 130; 84, n. 175; 256; 283, n. 208.

tions futures. Dans Ex-Nb-Dt, le choix est présenté comme une question de vie ou de mort (Dt 11,26-31; 28; 30,15-20). Enfin, le texte final peut avoir une structure significative qui relève non d'une seule intention, mais de la convergence des intentions propres à chaque «composition». E.B. le note lui-même dans deux cas (les plaies d'Égypte [242-243]; Ex 14[262]). Mais ce travail conduirait sans doute à écrire un autre livre.

Ces quelques remarques devraient montrer à suffisance que cette thèse peut fournir ample matière à de fructueux échanges. Elle alimentera certainement les débats des prochaines années sur le Pentateuque. Solide et bien charpentée, elle se lit avec un intérêt plus que soutenu.

Via della Pilotta, 25
I-00187 Roma

Jean Louis SKA, SJ

RECENSIONES

Vetus Testamentum

Thomas B. DOZEMAN, *God on the Mountain. A Study of Redaction, Theology and Canon in Exodus 19-24* (SBL Monograph Series 37). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1989. ix-224 p. 15 × 23

Mit Ex 19–24 behandelt D. einen bekannt schwierigen Textbereich, an dem schon so manche Pentateuchexegese (ältere wie neuere) sich der Grenzen der Analysemöglichkeit bewußt werden mußte. Von daher beeindruckt zunächst einmal die Klarheit und Bestimmtheit der hier vorgelegten Hypothese zur Entstehung und Theologie dieses Abschnitts. In seiner konsequent redaktionsgeschichtlich angelegten Erklärung unterscheidet D. drei literarische Stadien, die in ihrem Textbestand, in ihren Konzeptionen und Intentionen präzise rekonstruiert werden.

Am Anfang steht eine vorexilische “Gottesbergüberlieferung” mit Einleitung (A), Theophanie (B) und abschließender Opferfeier (C) in (A) 19,2b-3a, (B) 19,10aβ-11a.12aα.13b-15a.16aβ-17, (C) 24,4aβ-5. Der Berg ist hier anonym; die Konzeption der Gottesgegenwart reflektiert aber den (vorexilischen) Zion. Ausdrücklich offen läßt D. den weiteren Kontext dieser Grundschrift (eigenständige Einheit im Rendtorffschen Sinne oder größerer Zusammenhang?). Jedenfalls wurde sie spät-vorexilisch/exilisch von einer “deuteronomistischen Redaktion” planvoll theologisch überarbeitet. Dazu gehören: (A) 19,3b-5bα.6b-8a, (B) 8b-9a.19; 20,1-20, (C) 20,21–23,32; 24,3-4aα.7. Der Berg wird zum dtn/dtr Horeb; die Theophanie hat nun ihr Zentrum im Hören der Gottesrede (Dekalog); die Opferfeier wird umgestaltet zum Bundesschluß, wozu bereits 20,22 ff (Mitteilung des Bundesbuches) gehört; die herausgehobene Rolle Moses als Mittler und Lehrer des Gesetzes entspricht der im Dtn.

Für die Endgestalt ist schließlich die “priesterliche Redaktion” (exilisch/nachexilisch) verantwortlich: (A) 19,1-2a.5bβ-6a, (B) 19,11b.12aβ-13.15b.16aα.18.20-25, (C) 24,1-2.5.6.8.9-11.15b-18a. Hier erst ist der Weltberg mit dem Sinai identifiziert; JHWH kommt herab zur visuellen Theophanie im Feuer; das Volk wird durch kultische Reinigung vorbereitet; der Bundesschluß in 24 wird zu einer Heiligungszeremonie für das Volk ausgeweitet und dessen Vertreter dürfen (in Aufnahme einer ursprünglich eigenständigen Theophanieüberlieferung: 24,1a.9-11) an der Visio Dei teilhaben.

Die komplexe Sinaiperikope entpuppt sich für D. somit nicht als Knäuel verschiedener Quellenfäden, sondern als Resultat mehrfacher redaktioneller Fortschreibung. Zugleich spiegeln sich in diesem Prozeß fortschreitende theologische Reflexionen, insbesondere über den Modus der kultischen Gegenwart Gottes: Die Grundschrift impliziert den Wohngedanken der Zionstradition; die dtr Redaktion wendet dagegen kritisch die Unterscheidung von himmlischer Wohnung und Gottesberg, zu dem Gott "kommt" (כָּבֹד); dem steht wiederum das priesterliche Konzept vom "herabkommenden" Kabod gegenüber, der auf dem Berg/im Heiligtum zeitweilig "tabernakelt" (טָבַעַר) (ebenso wie von Rad muß D. allerdings die Komponente vom "Herabkommen" des Kabod eintragen; die neuere Diskussion [z.B. B. Janowski, *Sühne als Heilsgeschehen* (Neukirchen-Vluyn 1982) 295 ff.] scheint nicht rezipiert zu sein). Gegensätzlich ist auch der Entwurf Israels: fundiert auf exklusive Erwählung (19,5ba, dtr) bzw. auf Heiligung zum Priestervolk unter den Völkern (19,5bβ, P-Red.).

Ein eigenes Kapitel (Kap. 5) widmet D. dem Verständnis der damit erreichten Endgestalt in Ex 19–24 — erfreulicherweise ohne den heutzutage nicht seltenen Kopfsprung in eine überzeitliche Synchronität. Die Problemstellung wächst vielmehr aus dem redaktionsgeschichtlichen Zugang heraus: Wie sind "the univocal claim of Torah" und "the diverse theologies which make up the substructure of the canonical Pentateuch" (146) aufeinander zu beziehen? Besonders die spannungsvollen Doppelungen der priesterlichen Überlieferung zur vorpriesterlichen und ihre literarischen "spatial form devices" (ohne Rücksicht auf einen glatten Erzählfluß) bedeuten eine Herausforderung an die Interpreten: Sie erlauben weder die willkürliche Beschränkung auf *eine* Stimme im Text noch eine glättende Harmonisierung, sondern zielen auf die Wahrnehmung der Ambiguitäten und die Konstituierung von "opaque similarities". Die priesterliche Schicht ist in dem Sinne eine "kanonbewußte" Redaktion, daß sie die fundamental verschiedenen Konzepte von Horeb und Sinai (gleichberechtigt) als die eine Offenbarung am Gottesberg präsentiert (und den Lesern damit zur Aufgabe macht).

Das gesellschaftliche Korrelat zu dieser Traditionsbildung findet D. in den Spannungen und der Kompromißfindung zwischen konkurrierenden deuteronomistischen und priesterlichen Gruppen (Kap. 6). Anregend ist die These, die Teilnehmer an der Gottesschau in 24,9–11 repräsentierten geradezu diesen Kompromiß, wobei Aaron für die Priester stehe und die 70 Ältesten für die "deuteronomistische Gruppe". In der Tat legen es manche, auch von D. genannte Belege nahe, nach einem eventuellen Zusammenhang zwischen der in nachexilischer Zeit wohl durch ein Ältestengremium vertretenen Laienaristokratie und der nicht-priesterlichen ("dtr") Pentateuchüberlieferung zu fragen. Entsprechende Anzeichen könnten sich noch verdichten, wenn man z.B. — gegen D. — die kompositionellen Konnexionen zwischen Ex 24,9–11 und der Ältesten-Schicht in Num 11 innerhalb des D-Pentateuch beachtet oder die in Nu 16 artikulierte Frontstellung zwischen Aaroniden und "Notablen". D.s Deutung von Nadab und Abihu in Ex 24,9 als "link" zwischen beiden Gruppen (185 ff.) hingegen bleibt trotz des Verweises auf Lev 10 spekulativ (in Lev 10 geht es nicht um die "limita-

tion of priestly power", sondern um die Gefahren kultischen Mißbrauchs). Geschichtlich verknüpft D. die "kanonbewußte" Redaktion mit der offiziellen Sendung Esras (Esr 7), die in der Promulgation des kanonischen Pentateuch bestand.

D.s Untersuchung bewegt sich — von gelegentlichen Ungenauigkeiten (cf. die Darstellung der Rendtorffschen Position S. 11) abgesehen — auf der Höhe der neueren Pentateuchdiskussion. Auch arbeitet er (was bei englischsprachigen Arbeiten leider nicht mehr selbstverständlich ist) mit fremdsprachiger Literatur nicht nur, soweit sie bereits übersetzt ist, und er kennt ältere Untersuchungen nicht bloß aus zweiter und dritter Hand. Die ausgesprochen klare Darstellung gibt dem Leser jede erdenkliche Hilfestellung.

Kritische Rückfragen sind in erster Linie wohl auf die Bestimmung der "priesterlichen Redaktion" zu beziehen. Daß D. ohne eigene Begründung mit der Annahme einer *Redaktion* (gemäß F.M. Cross u.a.) als Arbeitshypothese arbeitet, mag im Blick auf den begrenzten Textbereich verständlich sein. Fraglich ist jedoch die textliche Definition, die von der üblichen Abgrenzung der "P"-Schicht erheblich abweicht. Sie gründet sich auf eine — je nach Bedarf — übergenaue Distinktion bzw. großzügige Verwischung konzeptioneller Differenzen. So scheidet D. Ex 19,5bß-6a als priesterliche Ergänzung aus der ansonsten dtr Gottesrede aus. Doch die Argumentation arbeitet mit mehreren Verkürzungen (93 ff.): Weder erscheinen die literarkritisch behaupteten Spannungen von V. 5bß zum Vorkontext zwingend, noch erweisen die Spezifika von V. 6 diesen Dtn 7,16 gegenüber als undeuteronomistisch, noch steht die göttliche *Zusage* der Heiligkeit Israels von 19,6 in einem konzeptionellen Gegensatz zu Dtn 7,16 (ebensowenig wie die *Zusage* der Erwählung in 19,5ba – D.: dtr) noch auf der gleichen Linie wie die (priesterliche) *Forderung* nach Heiligung in Ex 31,13 par. Wenn D. so dann als Entsprechung zu 19,6 auch die Verse 24,5.6.8 für die priesterliche Redaktion aussondert, ist dies nur konsequent. Und der Vergleich des Blutritus (24,8) mit Lev 8 hat sein *traditionsgeschichtliches* Recht. Doch scheint D. zu übersehen, daß der Gedanke einer priesterlichen Heiligung des *ganzen* Volkes (24,8) ein Kernstück der "P"-Konzeption geradezu auf den Kopf stellt (vgl. nur Ex 28 f. und die Auseinandersetzung in Num 16 f.!). Hier schlägt auch die enge Begrenzung des untersuchten Textbereiches durch, insofern nicht in den Blick kommt, daß die Aussonderung der Leviten (!) in Ex 32 (!) als Rücknahme des "allgemeinen Priestertums" mit 24,5 ff. einen direkten kompositorischen Zusammenhang bildet. In der Linie von 19,5 f.; 24,3-8; 32 tritt die priesterliche Funktion der Leviten an die Stelle des "allgemeinen Priestertums", bedeutet für Israel mithin eine *Statusminderung* als Folge des Abfalls; in der "P"-Linie von Ex 25 ff. hingegen erscheint das aaronitische Priestertum als göttliche Heilssetzung! Anders gewendet: mit 19,6; 24,5.6.8 werden just einige der markantesten Bausteine aus der nicht-priesterlichen ("dtr") Komposition (E. Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch* [Berlin 1990] 51 ff.) herausgebrochen.

Als ein letztes Beispiel sei hier die Zuweisung von Ex 19,20-25 zur priesterlichen Schicht aufgeführt. In der Tat geht es in diesen Versen um Fragen des priesterlichen Amtes, insbesondere wohl um die Sonderstellung des Ho-

henpriesters — dies aber in einer (späten) punktuellen Erweiterung nach Art eines Midrasch (W. Rudolph; Blum, a.a.O. 48 f). Es besteht kein kompositioneller Zusammenhang mit der Überlieferung von Ex 25 ff.; und noch weniger fügt sich der Abschnitt in D.s eigene redaktionelle Rekonstruktion ein: 19,24 steht in mehrfachem, unüberbrückbarem Widerspruch zu 24,1-2.9-11 (nach D.: P-Red.)!

Der bisherige, relativ breite Konsens bei der Abgrenzung der "P"-Schicht basiert vor allem auf einem Syndrom konzeptioneller und phraseologischer Merkmale sowie kompositioneller Konnexionen (häufig sekundiert durch literarkritische Indizien). D.s. Versuch, diese Maßstäbe in Ex 19-24 aufzuweichen hat wenig für sich. Damit sind freilich wesentliche Teile der Gesamthypothese in Frage gestellt: Nicht nur der Entwurf einer Theologie der priesterlichen Redaktion, sondern auch (wie schon angedeutet) Textbestand und Theologie der vorausgehenden dtr Redaktion. Deren Bild erscheint ohnedies in vieler Hinsicht mit allzu einfachen und breiten Strichen gezeichnet. Ihre Identifikation, beispielsweise, mit "the first redaction of the Book of Deuteronomy" in Dtn 5,1-6,3 (70) bleibt — selbst wenn man die Existenz der letzteren zugestehen wollte — ebenso gewagt wie unzureichend begründet. Ebenso würde man eine Erörterung der besonderen Problematik von Ex 23,20-33 erwarten. Und läßt sich das Bundesbuch so einfach als "deuteronomisches" Gesetz ausgeben, das erst mit der dtr Redaktion an den Gottesberg kam?

D.s vor-dtr Grundschrift kennt noch keine Gebotsmitteilung am Gottesberg. Deren erzählerische Rekonstruktion freilich hängt letzten Endes an der Deutung von במשך היכל המה יעלו בהר (19,13b) als einer Anweisung zu *opfern*, die in 24,4aβ.5 zur Ausführung komme. Doch, von allen anderen Einwänden abgesehen: עלול allein (mit Ortsangabe!) bedeutet nicht "opfern" (24,5 heißt es עלול עלול!). 19,13b bezeichnet vielmehr die terminierte Aufhebung des Verbots von V. 12aβ (השמרו לכם עלות בהר) (das D. zuvor literarkritisch ausgeschieden hat). Gewiß lassen sich vielerlei Gründe für eine vor-dtr Grundlage in Ex 19 ff. denken. Die inneren Schwierigkeiten von D.s Versuch dürften aber die Zweifel daran bestärken, ob eine Rekonstruktion ihres Wortlauts (und überdies eine vollständige) noch möglich ist.

Die kritischen Rückfragen an D.s Analyse ließen sich mehrten. Ihre Probleme sind teilweise wohl in der engen textlichen Begrenzung begründet. Eine Pentateuchhypothese mit übergreifendem Erklärungsanspruch läßt sich nicht auf *einen* Textausschnitt fundieren, sei er noch so zentral. Auch wenn man D.s Einzelanalyse mithin nicht unbedingt zu folgen bereit ist, formuliert er gleichwohl mit der Grundthese einer "Kompromißbildung" zwischen "deuteronomistisch" geprägten und priesterlichen Tradenten (wobei letztere in ihrem Werk die dtr Überlieferung integrieren) einen entscheidenden Aspekt, der sich m.E. auch am übrigen Befund im Pentateuch bewährt. Mehr noch, überblickt man die neueste, vielstimmige Pentateuchdebatte, dann könnte diese Grundeinsicht m.E. zu einer der künftigen Konvergenz- und Kristallisationslinien taugen. Nur wird man vielfach (auch in Ex 19-24) doch mit komplexeren Sachverhalten zu rechnen haben, als das D.s reinliches 3-Stufen-Modell suggeriert. Auch muß man sich hinsichtlich Natur und Tendenz der "Kompromißbildung" von jeglichem Pauschalur-

teil hüten: Anstatt der von D. unterstellten Gleichwertigkeit der divergierenden Überlieferungen scheint beispielsweise häufig eine korrektive Dominanz der priesterlichen Überlieferung intendiert zu sein (vgl. z.B. Gen 35,9 ff. neben 28,11 ff., Ex 6 neben Ex 3 f., Num 16 ff. neben Dtn 18,1-8). — So oder so bleibt die synchrone und diachrone Erklärung gerade der offenen Diskontinuitäten im kanonischen Pentateuch ein Prüfstein für die alten und neuen Hypothesen. Und dafür hält D.s Arbeit wichtige Anregungen bereit. Unbeschadet aller möglichen Einwände bildet sie einen eigenständigen und beachtenswerten Beitrag zur gegenwärtigen Pentateuchdiskussion.

Mühlingstraße, 23
D-6900 Heidelberg

Erhard BLUM

Ludger CAMP, *Hiskija und Hiskijabild. Analyse und Interpretation von 2 Kön 18–20* (Münsteraner Theologische Abhandlungen 9). Altenberge, Telos Verlag, 1990. 339 p. 15 × 21. DM 43,80

Une nouvelle fois, la section de 2 Rois consacrée à Ezéchias et à son règne se trouve remise sur le chantier. Dans le cas présent, l'auteur se donne pour objectif de dégager la figure historique du roi, autant que faire se peut, et de mettre en lumière les représentations successives qu'en donnent les diverses couches rédactionnelles.

Une telle démarche présuppose une analyse littéraire précise et donc une prise de position claire dans le débat concernant le processus de formation de l'histoire deutéronomiste (DtrG). L'auteur y consacre sa première partie. Le débat se résume, de façon quelque peu schématique, à deux thèses principales qui s'affrontent: «Cross versus Smend». Le premier défend l'existence d'une strate préexilique, élaborée au temps de Josias, suivie d'une seconde édition exilique. Le second ne reconnaît ici que des éditions exiliques et postexiliques. Sans méconnaître les problèmes qu'elle pose quant à la date et aux intentions théologiques, L. C. prend clairement parti pour la seconde hypothèse et reconnaît trois couches principales: DtrH, l'historien deutéronomiste; DtrP, intéressé par le phénomène prophétique; et DtrN qui a pour axe théologique central l'observance des commandements.

Dans ce cadre ainsi défini, l'auteur entreprend une analyse détaillée de 2 R 18-20. Comme point de départ, il retient les sections qui font l'objet d'un certain consensus dans la classe exégétique: 2 R 18,1-16 et 20,20-21 (A); 2 R 18,17-19,9a.36ab.37, premier récit de la campagne assyrienne (B1); 2 R 19,9b-35.36aß, second récit de la campagne (B2); 2 R 20,1-11: la guérison d'Ezéchias; 2 R 20,12-19, l'ambassade de Mérodach-Baladan. Il soumet chacune de ces sections et de leurs composantes à une critique précise, pour déterminer ce qui revient à chacune des strates de DtrG et à leurs sources. Au terme de son analyse, L. C. aboutit à ce qu'il appelle une «Redaktionsgeschichtliche Hypothese» qui, en fait, relève les points forts («Eckdaten») de ce développement.

1. Le texte A est fondamentalement l'œuvre de DtrH qui synthétisa les données fournies par ses sources, les Annales Royales. DtrN y laisse sa trace en complétant 18,4.8.16 et en insérant 18,5-7a.9.12.13a.

2. Dans l'ensemble de 18,17-20,19, la péricope de 20,12-17 qui porte un regard critique sur le règne d'Ezéchias relèverait de DtrP. Le DtrN aurait nuancé et corrigé ce tableau par l'insertion de 20,1-7.18.19.

3. DtrP aurait complété la couche fondamentale (« Grundschrift ») de B1, primitivement indépendant et prédeutéronomiste, avec les versets 18,19b.20b.21.24b.25.28b β -30a qui parsèment le discours du Rab-Shaquéh, et qui en même temps font écho aux critiques d'Isaïe contre le roi. Il s'agirait de rendre Ezéchias responsable, au moins en partie, de la catastrophe de 587. En associant à ce récit ainsi réinterprété 2 R 20,12 β -17, il compose un diptyque construit sur l'axe annonce-accomplissement.

4. Le récit de base de B2, lui aussi primitivement indépendant et prédeutéronomiste, présentait Ezéchias comme un roi pieux et s'intéressait surtout à la délivrance de la « ville », œuvre de la pure grâce divine. DtrN va l'associer à 20,1-7, texte construit à partir d'un récit prophétique de guérison (20,1.3b.7). Ainsi démontre-t-il sa thèse selon laquelle le salut survient là où les commandements sont pratiqués (cf. encore 18,22 et 20,18-19), qu'il s'agisse de la sphère publique (B2) ou du domaine privé (guérison d'Ezéchias).

5. L. C. relève quelques traces d'interventions postdeutéronomistes, dont le poème satirique de 19,21-28 et le signe prophétique de 19,29-31. Voir aussi 18,33-35 et peut-être 18,5b β .

La 3^{ème} Partie retrace les portraits d'Ezéchias que ces diverses couches esquissent successivement. A l'aide des sources anciennes, il tente une « approche » (ou une approximation? « Annäherung ») historique. Ezéchias aurait régné de 725 à 696. On peut lui imputer le retrait du mystérieux serpent de bronze appelé *Nehuštān* (18,4) à condition de ne pas y voir l'amorce d'une réforme religieuse, mais plutôt un acte politique de rébellion à l'égard de l'Assyrie. Profitant sans doute de la faiblesse d'Assur (703-701) lors du changement de règne occasionné par la mort de Sargon, il tenta d'en secouer le joug. La révolte échoua et le roi dut payer tribut (18,13b-16). Nous ignorons le lieu de sa sépulture.

Les récits de base de B1 et de B2, prédeutéronomistes, interprètent à leur façon les événements de 701. Selon la « Grundschrift » de B1, ceux-ci sont l'œuvre de YHWH seul, intervenant par le biais des causes secondes. Le rôle d'Ezéchias n'est guère marqué et le récit ne connaît encore rien d'une délivrance de Jérusalem. Le fond de B2 est essentiellement un récit théologique. Il développe en particulier le thème de l'unicité de Dieu et le fait que le salut consiste surtout dans la délivrance de Jérusalem « l'intouchable ». On serait sur la voie qui conduira à la représentation du combat eschatologique des peuples rassemblés à Sion.

Viennent ensuite les éditions de DtrG. La première, DtrH rédigée sans doute au lendemain de la catastrophe de 587, voudrait rendre compte de cet événement malheureux à l'aide de « l'étiologie du point zéro ». Mais, en même temps, L. C. croit pouvoir repérer quelques traces d'ouvertures positives

sur l'avenir. Le jugement de DtrH, moins sévère et moins négatif pour la royauté du Sud que pour celle du Nord, n'exclut pas un avenir positif pour Juda. Exploitant l'expulsion du *Nehušṭān*, DtrH en fait l'occasion d'une réforme religieuse, dans la ligne de la théologie deutéronomique: en détruisant les *bāmôt*, Ezéchias préparait la voie à la centralisation du culte. Par ailleurs, la référence à David (18,3) ne laisse-t-elle pas augurer d'une restauration de Juda?

Le centre d'unification des matériaux rassemblés sous le sigle DtrP serait la vision réaliste et sans complaisance de l'histoire et des royaumes. Le diptyque, composé de B1, relu et réinterprété, et de 20,12-17, renvoie à l'exil de Juda selon le schéma promesse-accomplissement. L'axe théologique tourne autour des deux termes *bṭḥ* «avoir confiance» et *nṣl* «délivrer». Mais leur interconnexion est d'un type tout à fait particulier: autant la délivrance purement gratuite atteste la fidélité de Dieu, autant la confiance d'Ezéchias en Dieu reste sujette à caution. Cette infidélité du roi est responsable de la catastrophe de 587. Ce tableau présuppose l'expérience de l'exil et les désillusions provoquées par la perte de la souveraineté politique. Tout n'est pas perdu pour autant: le salut reste possible, si, à l'encontre du comportement d'Ezéchias, on met sa confiance dans le «Dieu des délivrances».

La troisième et dernière couche de DtrG, DtrN, n'est pas plus unifiée que la seconde, DtrP. En rattachant B2 à B1, elle atténue considérablement la critique de DtrP et redonne à Ezéchias le visage d'un roi profondément religieux; celui-ci devient le paradigme de la vie réussie, parce qu'il observe les commandements (18,6b), met sa confiance en YHWH (18,22) et travaille à la centralisation du culte (18,5). En même temps, 19,34 lie étroitement la théologie de Sion à la promesse davidique; mais cette théologie de Sion se trouve déseschatologisée et intégrée à la théologie de la loi. Le salut devient «ce qui est bien aux yeux de YHWH».

Ce travail mérite grande attention. Argumenté et précis, il offre une solution originale à une question unanimement reconnue comme complexe. Bien informé, l'auteur dialogue constamment avec ses prédécesseurs. Au terme d'analyses souvent détaillées, il sait ramasser les conclusions dans des résumés précieux pour la consultation et la vérification de l'hypothèse globale.

Cet ouvrage appelle cependant un certain nombre de questions. Et, en premier lieu, celle des présupposés. L. C. s'inscrit dans une ligne bien définie d'interprétation, disons celle de Smend pour faire court, qui voit dans DtrG une œuvre exilique et postexilique. L'auteur prend le temps de justifier ses positions (1ère Partie) et il le fait avec clarté. Cependant, peut-on en quelques pages traiter d'un problème aussi fondamental? Sans doute, l'auteur ne pouvait-il faire autrement. Mais il faudra se souvenir que l'analyse littéraire et les conclusions théologiques qui en découlent restent marquées au coin par les limites de l'hypothèse même. Reconnaissons que, dans ces limites, l'ouvrage apporte une contribution de valeur à la recherche exégétique sur cette section du livre des Rois. Il y a pour le moins vraisemblance, et les remarques qui suivent se développent dans la perspective de ce choix préalable.

On peut d'abord regretter, pour la clarté de l'exposé, que l'auteur n'ait pas tenté, fût-ce en soulignant ici ou là le caractère hypothétique de sa synthèse, un exposé systématique de toute l'histoire de la rédaction, depuis les sources jusqu'aux dernières retouches. L'auteur paraît avoir renoncé délibérément à cette démarche (253), pour se limiter à ce qu'il appelle les « Eckdaten ». Mais des questions demeurent posées: A quel(s) niveau(x) de rédaction B1 et B2 furent-ils intégrés à DtrG? L. C. y fait allusion ici ou là, sans prendre clairement parti. Dtr a-t-il retouché B1 avant son insertion en DtrG? Quelles étaient les finalités de ces intégrations? A quelles problématiques répondaient-elles? On aurait aussi souhaité qu'un tableau reprenne visuellement cette croissance du texte. Cela faciliterait beaucoup le parcours du livre, les vérifications, etc...

Est-il possible d'éviter une confrontation entre le texte de 2 R 18-20 et celui d'Is 38-39? L'auteur se pose la question (53-61) et conclut à l'impossibilité de prouver la dépendance d'une recension par rapport à l'autre. Aussi adopte-t-il le postulat selon lequel ces deux recensions doivent être analysées séparément. Peut-être, mais les textes sont si proches l'un de l'autre que l'on peut se demander si dans le détail, au moins de façon pragmatique, une telle confrontation ne s'impose pas, sans pour autant aboutir nécessairement à l'antériorité d'un des deux textes par rapport à l'autre.

Les conclusions théologiques sont particulièrement suggestives et souvent fondées. Rallieront-elles en tout point l'accord des critiques? Ce n'est pas sûr. Ainsi, les interpolations de DtrP dans le discours du Rab-Shaqéh en B1 se voudraient une critique voilée d'Ezéchias, empruntée aux oracles isaïens. Une telle vue des choses n'introduit-elle pas une dysharmonie dans le récit de B1 qui se dénoue par une réponse positive du prophète lui-même (19,6-7) et une issue favorable (19,7-8.9a.36ab.37)? Toute la question tourne autour de la signification de ces interpolations « isaïennes » dans le discours de l'aide de camp. Ne peut-on pas interpréter ces allusions autrement que ne le fait L. C.? Ce rédacteur ne voudrait-il pas montrer, avec quelque humour, qu'en définitive le salut intervient là où se trouve la confiance en YHWH? Le Rab-Shaqéh, il est vrai, reprend à son compte les critiques d'Isaïe à l'encontre d'Ezéchias (confiance dans les armes, dans les alliances étrangères...). Mais la suite du texte montrera que, dans la détresse où il se trouve, Ezéchias n'a plus d'autre recours que YHWH lui-même et c'est pourquoi il se tourne vers son prophète. Face à cette conversion, celui-ci promulgue un oracle de salut.

Par le fait même, cette interprétation a l'avantage d'éviter ces troubles volte-face dans le regard porté sur Ezéchias tout au long de l'histoire du texte. Comment expliquer en effet que pour DtrH Ezéchias soit un bon roi (18,3-4), tandis que DtrP en donne une vision défavorable, à l'encontre de DtrN qui en fait le paradigme du roi pieux, fidèle aux commandements de YHWH (18,5-7a)? On comprend mal ces brusques revirements dans la tradition du texte.

De même, L. C. demeure très imprécis en ce qui concerne la physionomie de DtrP et de DtrN. Si l'on comprend bien, il rassemble sous ces sigles des interventions diversifiées autour d'un même « Kerygma ». Une telle position nous laisse sur notre faim: on aimerait savoir à quelles problématiques

ques répondent ces retouches, dans quels cadres elles ont été exécutées... Pour être plus précis, on peut s'interroger sur l'opportunité de rassembler sous le même sigle de DtrN des éléments aussi divers que 19,34, qui évoque la protection de la ville associée à la promesse davidique, et 18,5-7a qui prônent la fidélité aux commandements.

La tentative de retrouver la figure historique d'Ezéchias est méritoire et légitime, d'autant que l'auteur parle « d'approche » historique. Toutefois, à cette fin, il invoque la proximité temporelle des « sources » par rapport aux événements (266). Cet argument n'est pas sans valeur, mais les « théologiens » ne sont pas les seuls à réinterpréter les événements en fonction de leurs présupposés. Il peut y avoir des relations tendancieuses, contemporaines des faits, et les chroniques royales peuvent être de cet ordre. Il convient, à toutes fins utiles, d'entreprendre la critique du témoignage.

Un certain nombre d'erreurs dans les références rendent la lecture plus difficile: p. 109, ligne 7, lire 18,17 au lieu de 18,7; p. 235, 1. 2 du 2^o § et p. 261, 3^o 1. avant la fin, lire 20,1.3b.7 au lieu de 20,1.3a.7; p. 263, 1. 9., lire 20,8-11 au lieu de 28,8-11; p. 299, lire 14ab α et non 14aab $\beta\alpha$. Le haut de la p. 133 reprend le bas de la p. 132; de même p. 197s. A l'inverse, il manque quelques mots ou quelques phrases entre la p. 59 et la p. 60, ce qui rend le texte illisible. L. Schwienhorst 1986, signalé p. 53-54, n'est pas mentionné dans la bibliographie.

Ces remarques, qui sont plus des interrogations que des critiques, ne veulent en rien minimiser la valeur de ce travail qui constituera un passage obligé pour tout chercheur qui s'occupera de cette section du livre des Rois, mais aussi pour celui qui s'intéresse à l'histoire deutéronomiste.

32 Avenue du Général de Gaulle
F-67000 Strasbourg

Bernard RENAUD

Lennart BOSTRÖM, *The God of the Sages. The Portrayal of God in the Book of Proverbs* (ConB OT 29). Stockholm, Almqvist & Wiksell, 1990. x-260 p. 15,5 × 22. SEK 172,—

One of the most striking reversals of opinion in Old Testament studies in recent years has been the rehabilitation of the relevance of the wisdom books (Proverbs, Job and Ecclesiastes) for Old Testament theology. Their undeniable similarities both in form and content to literary works from other parts of the ancient Near East, especially Egypt and Mesopotamia, together with their silence about Israel and Israel's national traditions and *Heilsgeschichte*, long caused the wisdom books to be regarded as an alien corpus within the Canon, to be virtually disregarded by many Old Testament theologians, and to be an embarrassment to others. Even before the discovery of their international connections they were prized mainly for their ethical rather than for their theological value, it being generally assumed that 'the wise men took for granted the main postulates of Israel's creed, and applied themselves rather to the observation of human

character' (S. R. Driver). This was held to be particularly true of Proverbs; but even Job and Ecclesiastes were seen — again, for example, by Driver — primarily as reflections upon the problems presented by this 'observation of human character' rather than as theological and theocentric works.

That it should have been thought that the wisdom books had no significant contribution to make to the study of theology would surely seem extremely odd to an outside observer: it is a reasonable supposition that if such a person, with no previous acquaintance with the Old Testament, were asked, after being introduced to it, which of its books are the most theological, it would be the wisdom books that he would single out, as being wholly concerned with God and his relation to the world. It is only when Old Testament theology is defined in a particular and restrictive way that these books can be said to be unworthy of consideration for this purpose — as not 'fitting' that definition. In fact the marginalization of them for theological purposes raises fundamental questions, not least concerning the adequacy of an interpretation of Old Testament theology which excludes the witness of an entire group of canonical books which, so far from being regarded as 'alien', were accepted, preserved and eventually canonized as part of Holy Scripture. If the Jewish community recognized the God of the wisdom books as their God, it becomes doubtful whether an Old Testament theology which ignores them can be an adequate one. Was not the God worshipped by the ancient Israelites not a more *many-sided* God than some Old Testament theologians have been prepared to admit?

It is with such questions, which are now being posed more and more insistently, that Boström's book is concerned. He has chosen as the subject of his enquiry what must be regarded as the crucial text: the book of Proverbs. The book is crucial to the enquiry partly because of the wide range of material which it contains and partly because some of this material appears to come from an early stage in Israel's intellectual development and is ostensibly more in touch with the concrete realities of the daily life of individuals whose 'official' religion as a people was the worship of Yahweh. Further, the nature of God as portrayed in Proverbs, which is the subject of this book, is obviously the central question on which the assessment of the theological value of that book depends.

That this portrayal has strong affinities with the portrayal of the god or gods who appear in comparable Near Eastern texts is undisputed; and it is maintained by some scholars that 'the way in which the earlier wisdom of Israel speaks of Yahweh differs not at all from the way in which the wisdom literature of the ancient Near East speaks of God or the gods' (H. D. Preuß, "Das Gottesbild der ältesten Weisheit Israels", *Studies in the Religion of Ancient Israel* [VTS 23; Leiden 1972] 117-145, cf. 119). Boström sets out to test this opinion by a detailed comparison of the text of Proverbs both with comparable Near Eastern texts and with the other books of the Old Testament.

Boström divides his main discussion, after an introductory chapter, into two parts. Part I discusses first the portrayal of God as Creator and then the question of retribution and order in the world; Part II discusses first the supremacy of God as transcendent and sovereign, and then

Yahweh as personal God: his concern for the weak and his protection of, and intimacy with, the righteous man. In each chapter he compares the teaching of Proverbs first with other Old Testament traditions and then with non-Israelite wisdom. There is inevitably a good deal of overlap between these themes, resulting in a degree of repetition; but the method is on the whole a sound one, the arrangement logical, and the identification of major themes and their coverage unexceptional, except in one respect. Very little attention is paid to the concept of personified Wisdom in chapters 1–9. Since Wisdom is there portrayed both in relation to the creation of the world of men, a much fuller discussion of the reasons for the introduction of the figure and of its implications for the doctrine of God in these chapters is required than is provided here.

Boström's contribution to the discussion of the thorny question of retribution is particularly penetrating. He takes issue with Koch and others who find in Proverbs a belief in the impersonal operation of an automatic principle according to which human actions contain within themselves the seeds of their consequences and in which God is not actively involved. He concedes that the world was generally seen as conforming to an established order in which cause and effect normally operated, but insists that this order was not regarded as inflexible, and was controlled by a supreme Creator who was totally free to intervene in the course of events. He rejects the view that the absence of references to God in many of the proverbs which speak of human actions and their consequences indicates a 'secular' attitude which by implication excludes the active participation of Yahweh. His conclusion is that human destiny was perceived as the result of a *combination* of the natural process of cause and effect inherent in the order set up by God, and of direct divine action. He also makes the interesting observation that the interpretation of these proverbs as speaking of the 'act — consequence' relationship is not accurate: the real relationship is between *character* and consequence. The notion that a certain kind of person ultimately forges his own destiny is a much less rigid notion than one in which a particular action inevitably brings about the appropriate punishment or reward, and one which is more consonant with concrete reality.

In comparing these and other aspects of the portrayal of God in Proverbs on the one hand with Near Eastern beliefs and on the other with Old Testament traditions, Boström steers a middle course. On the one hand he argues that those characteristics of God which appear in Proverbs bear a general resemblance to those found in the non-Israelite literature, and that the differences between the two traditions are comparatively minor. On the other hand he finds that, although many of the attributes of Yahweh found elsewhere in the Old Testament are unmentioned in Proverbs, there is nothing in Proverbs which contradicts Old Testament teaching. Beliefs in a Creator and ruler of the world and in a personal God who is protector of the poor and upholder of the righteous are found both in the Old Testament and in the non-Israelite literature.

One of the effects of these comparisons is, then, to minimize to some degree the antithesis frequently supposed to exist between concepts of deity

in Israel and in the surrounding nations. There was 'a shared, conventional depiction of the deity as the supreme being' and also of a 'personal god of the individual' who was concerned for the weak and the oppressed (241). However, it was a peculiar characteristic of the monotheistic religion of Israel found in Proverbs as elsewhere in the Old Testament that the supreme God and the personal God were united in the person of a single deity. In this respect Proverbs, like the rest of the Old Testament, represents a unique and specific type of a common Near Eastern approach to religion, and one which because of this combination of supreme power and an intimate relationship to the world and the individual in a single deity, struck a more profoundly ethical note.

Two of the problems inherent in a study of this kind are the diverse nature of the material to be studied and the fact that Proverbs is in no sense a theological work. These problems are noted by Boström in the introductory chapter. With regard to the first, Boström in the first part of the book treats the main sections of Proverbs separately; but unfortunately not, or not always, in the second part. He also, perhaps understandably in view of the lack of consensus on the question in recent scholarship, makes no consistent attempt to distinguish between different strata *within* those sections, although in his introduction he had noted the problem. His treatment consequently sometimes leads to over-generalization and over-simplification. There is also, especially in the treatment of chapters 1-9, a tendency towards atomization which can lead to misleading conclusions. The argument is mainly based on a minute examination of individual fragments — justifiably, perhaps, in the case of the so-called 'sentence literature' which consists mainly of short individual proverbs. But in dealing with the instructional material in chapters 1-9 this method fails adequately to catch the distinctive ethos of those instructions as a whole: their exclusive concentration on getting ahead; their failure — in contrast with the sentence literature — even to mention the poor, much less to recognize a duty towards them; the rarity of their references to God, which also give the impression that obedience to him is mainly seen as a means to the attainment of a material goal; the emphasis on the all-sufficiency of the advice given by the human teacher — in other words, a 'theology', if it can be so called, utterly different from that of the rest of the book.

The second of the problems mentioned above, that is, the fact that Proverbs is not and is not intended to be a theological work, so that its theological or religious presuppositions do not lie on the surface of the text, points up the need to avoid undue generalizations. Boström speaks of Proverbs as reflecting personal or unofficial, as distinct from official, religion, and uses this distinction to account for its peculiar ethos, while arguing that the two are not incompatible but rather complementary. This is a good point. But it should not be assumed that all parts of Proverbs reflect the same personal 'theologies'. It can, for example, hardly be taken for granted that the personal religious attitudes of the master and pupils of the upper-class milieu of the instructions in chapters 1-9, of the — probably — middling farmers of the sentence literature, of the royal mother

and son of 31,1-9 or of the prosperous landowning family of 31,10-31 were identical. Despite the difficulties, more attention to the different social milieux in which the different parts of Proverbs were composed is necessary if their religious presuppositions are to be correctly assessed.

Nevertheless, this is an important and instructive study. Although much has been written on various aspects of the subject and a number of articles on the religion of Proverbs have appeared, it is, within the knowledge of this reviewer, the first full-scale work to be entirely devoted to the theme of the portrayal of God in the book of Proverbs as a whole. Its treatment of the subject is extremely thorough, with detailed examination of the relevant passage and of many comparable texts from the Old Testament and the relevant Egyptian and Mesopotamian literature. A large number of topics are discussed in debate with other scholars. These include, in addition to those already mentioned, such matters as the use of the term 'secular' with reference to ancient literature; the historical development and dating of both Israelite and other Near Eastern wisdom literatures; the place of 'creation theology' in the wisdom books; different traditions concerning the creation of the world; the question whether the creation of the world and of mankind were originally quite separate traditions; demythologization in the wisdom tradition; world order and Egyptian *maat*; personal gods in Egypt and Mesopotamia — to mention only some. As far as this reviewer is able to judge, the examples taken from non-Israelite literatures are balanced and well chosen. In its comprehensiveness and the meticulousness of its detailed discussion the book will take its place among the important contributions to the study not only of Proverbs and of Israelite wisdom literature in general, but also of ancient Israelite religion and theology and their relationship to the religious thought of the ancient Near East.

45 Hills Lane
Ely
GB-Cambridge CB6 1AY

R. N. WHYBRAY

W. A. M. BEUKEN, *Jesaja deel IIIA; deel IIIB* (De Prediking van het Oude Testament). Nijkerk, G.F. Callenbach, 1989. 282 p.; 178 p. 15 × 23. f79,50 (sub. f72,00); f65,50 (sub. f59,50)

A few years after the publication of his commentary on Deutero-Isaiah (cf. W.S. Prinsloo, *Bib* 63 [1982] 126-129), Prof. Beuken has completed his *magnum opus* with the publication of two volumes on Isa 56-66. This is a rich and well built commentary. The introduction is rather short and deals with such subjects as the time of Tr-Isa, the place of origin, language and style, the structure of Isa 56-66, and the message of Tr-Isa. The discussion of each pericope follows the same line: first the literary nature of the pericope is discussed, i.e. its delineation, genre and internal unity and structure. Then follows a detailed exegesis of each verse concluding with a

summary (*Samenvatting*). The exegesis offers a wealth of information on textual criticism, philology and translation, literary contacts and interpretation of the verse under consideration. It betrays a long and refined familiarity with the text.

Beuken is opposed to an exegesis which is limited to the study of the smallest units and he turns his attention especially to the larger context of the whole book and the literary place of verses and pericopes in it. The linear reading is normative in this commentary; at each point of the text the preceding context is presupposed. And this larger context is not limited to Isa 56-66, for Beuken considers Tr-Isa as a later literary continuation of Dt-Isa and, in a number of verses, also as the conclusion of the whole book of Isaiah. Thus Isa 66,15-24 would contain a number of semantic references to Isa 1-12, especially to the first chapters of the book. According to Beuken, Tr-Isa is only concerned with the question why the promises that were proclaimed by Dt-Isa are not yet fulfilled and how they can and finally will be fulfilled. As the main theme of Tr-Isa he sees the visionary account of how the progeny of the Servant comes into being and how YHWH fulfills his promises to them.

This commentary does not distinguish between literary-historical layers which would form more or less independent hermeneutic units. Nevertheless the author admits in a more explicit way than in his former volumes the legitimacy and even the necessity of an interpretation based on a literary-historical articulation of the text. But he states that such an approach would be out of place in the series in which his commentary is published. I wonder whether one can bluntly put it that way. It is my conviction that Tr-Isa was not written all at once and that the question of how one or more redactors have brought together pre-existing smaller or larger units into a broader literary structure and how they have adapted them to their new context cannot be ignored in any commentary. The investigation into that sort of question would perhaps exclude some of the structures or interpretations suggested by Beuken.

A few examples may illustrate the point. Because it fits his interpretation Beuken defends the authenticity of 59,21, although he must admit that there are serious literary indications of its secondary character (vol. I, 150). If Isa 51,5, which, according to Beuken is quoted in 60,9, is a later addition in its own context, as I have defended (VTS 24 [1973] 155-157), then the literary situation of 60,9 is affected by this fact. Regarding 61,2 Beuken mentions the supposition that a redactor has changed an original "day of salvation" into "day of vengeance" in connection with 59,17, but this remark does not play any part in his exegesis (I, 202). Again, the author is aware of the literary growth which has taken place in Isa 65, but he prefers to treat it as a unified piece (II, 58). With respect to 66,1-6, Beuken is inclined to attach more importance to redaction-critical considerations, since he must admit that these verses can hardly have been written by the same author as ch. 65. But this judgement comes only after the exegesis and does not have any impact on it. In his introduction Beuken already mentions the problem of how Isa 63,1-6 functions in the concentric structure around ch. 60-62, and in the analysis of this pericope he mentions

Steck's redaction-critical view that 63,1-6 together with 56,9-59,20 constitutes the first expansion of Isa 40-55; 60-62 (cf. *Bereitete Heimkehr* [Stuttgart 1985] 50ff., 80). But again this does not visibly affect the interpretation. Sometimes Beuken does exploit the redactional function of a verse in his exegesis, e.g. with regard to 65,16b, but these instances are very rare.

One of the major assets of this commentary is the constant reference to other Isaianic texts and to biblical parallels in general. However, I am afraid that these references sometimes are a little far-fetched and render too explicit what might be only a distant remembrance. On 57,15, for example, "I dwell in the high and holy place", Beuken gives the following comment: "Highness characterizes YHWH not only because He dwells in heaven, but also in so far as 'the high and lofty One' dwells in the temple of Jerusalem" (I, 84). This suggestion is based on the fact that the wording of the messenger formula would refer to Isa 6. If such a reference is really there, it is quite implicit, and then there is a real danger of *hineininterpretieren*. And this we certainly have when on p. 96 it is said that 57,15 concentrates attention on God's dwelling in his temple. Another example can be found in the exegesis of ch. 60, which is summarized on p. 194: "As the eschatological city which by her justice attracts nations and kings (60,1-3), Sion resembles the Servant, who as "a light to the nations" (42,6; 49,6) startles the nations and silences kings (52,15). No doubt, Tr-Isa, in connection with 55,5, has transferred the function of the Servant to Sion, but not without differences. The Servant goes to the nations, whereas the latter turn to Sion, and, above all, the Servant fulfills his task by subservience from the womb (49,5), whereas Sion first went the way of unrighteousness and therefore of God's wrath (50,1; 51,17; 59,9). Jerusalem rises out of sin to light; the Servant knows only the sins of the others as a burden which he must bear (53,4ff). But in Sion that is illuminated in the end the Servant can recognize his offspring (53,10)". I wonder whether all these connections were intended by the author/redactor at any level of the redaction. I am impressed by this synthetic view of ch. 60 but I am afraid it might be a little too subtle. A similar subtlety can be found in the comment on 64,11: "Since Tr-Isa is preoccupied with the question of who are the offspring of the Servant, the unique resemblance between 64,11 (*te'annēnū*) and 53,4 (*me'unneh*) is not accidental. By pointing out to YHWH that He afflicts them, those who pronounce this prayer identify with the Servant, hoping that they will obtain the salvation which was his share". Again, the reference to the Servant, if it is present at all, is very implicit. Also in 66,6 our commentator finds a very extensive intertextual background, which leads to an exegesis which, in my opinion, is overdone.

In his conclusion of the exegesis of ch. 61, Beuken states that Tr-Isa offers the convincing proof that Isa 40-55 was never read without the Servant Songs, because in ch. 61 the speaker has the qualities of the "herald of good tidings" (40,9) and of the Servant, who was invested with the spirit of YHWH. I fail to see the force of the argument. We may accept that Isa 61 has read Isa 40-55 including the Servant Songs, but that does not say anything about the whole of Tr-Isa nor about Isa 40-55 in its

original form. Beuken says that literary-historical exegesis rightly distinguishes between the prophet of Isa 40–55 and the Servant, but this statement ignores an important segment of that exegesis which precisely identifies the Servant with the prophet.

About the idea of a retribution in the after-world Beuken is quite positive without giving serious arguments. So the peace promised to the righteous in 57,2 “is more than the end of a no longer wanted existence” (I, 55). And “inherit my holy mountain” in 57,13 “cannot be limited to this life only” (I, 76).

Where Beuken has a *Samenvatting* (Summary) at the end of his exegesis of each pericope, the other commentaries in this series mostly have *De prediking van...* (The message of...), which broadly corresponds to the section *Ziel* in the series *Biblischer Kommentar*. In the introduction he says that one expects to find here something about the continuation of the text under consideration in the New Testament. But nowadays exegetes shy away from dogmatic constructions between the two Testaments in which the actual *Wirkungsgeschichte* is neglected. Therefore Beuken prefers to summarize the explanation of a passage with the help of the interpretation it has received in Jewish tradition. Is it not somewhat naïve to suppose that this approach needs less study of the *Wirkungsgeschichte*? It would have been preferable to expose briefly how the text has been understood and applied in both Jewish and Christian tradition. Apart from that, the summaries offer an excellent synthesis of the preceding analysis, without, however, giving suggestions for preaching or spirituality.

As for textual criticism, the author quite consistently rejects most of the emendations which have been suggested in scholarly literature. This is in agreement with recent trends in biblical exegesis which unconditionally stick to the MT. In my opinion, the decisive question is whether one wants to interpret a text from the biblical period or one from late antiquity if not from the Middle Ages. A critical approach is needed, based on an objective analysis of the textual witnesses, and not too much on one's own exegesis. A couple of examples: according to Beuken, in 57,11 the reading *ûma'lîm* (LXX *parorô*) instead of MT *ûmē'ôlām* should not be adopted in spite of numerous parallels, because, in his opinion, v.16 *l'ôlām* presupposes the Masoretic reading in v.11. With regard to 60,9 the conjecture of BHS to read *ke'lê 'iyyîm yiqqāwû*, “the vessels of the coastlands assemble” (cf. NEB), for MT *kî-lî 'iyyîm yeqawwû*, is rejected because the verse is a quotation from Isa 51,5. But what if 51,5 is itself a later addition (cf. *supra*), to which 60,9 has been adapted?

To conclude, let me touch on a few minor points. The transliteration *l'fā'ēr* (I,173) is not consistent with *'akabbed*, where the fricative pronunciation is not indicated; one should abstain from using *f* and either disregard the fricative pronunciation or consistently use *p* and *k*. Is it necessary to translate *kî* almost exclusively by “truly”? Is “I shall give him a complete comfort” a better rendering of *wa'āšallēm niḥumîm lô* than “I shall requite him with comfort” (RSV)?

The critical remarks in the foregoing lines should not mislead the reader. This commentary is an excellent piece of work. My remarks only

show the interest with which I have read it and they have no other objective than to stimulate discussion and to warn against the danger of one-sidedness which threatens every commentary. For me, reading Beuken's commentary was a real pleasure and an experience resulting in new insights and information. For a long time this will be a leading commentary for students of Tr-Isa and it is to be hoped that before long it will be translated into a more widely-known language.

KULeuven
Blijde-Inkomststraat 21
B-3000 Leuven

Antoon SCHOORS

Novum Testamentum

David B. HOWELL, *Matthew's Inclusive Story* (JSNT Supplement Series 42). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1990. 292 p. 14 × 22. £25.00-\$43.50

This book is the revised version of a doctoral dissertation presented to the faculty of theology at Oxford University and written under the supervision of John Fenton and Robert Morgan. As the title and subtitle indicate, it is a literary-critical study of Matthew's inclusive story. Matthew's story is inclusive, Howell explains, because one can detect in it a double horizon: on the one hand, Matthew tells the past story of Jesus; on the other hand, he also appears to address the contemporary Christians of his community. To understand these two horizons, Howell analyzes, by means of a narrative-critical and reader-response model of interpretation, both the rhetorical techniques of Matthew and the way in which a reader is to appropriate his text (chaps. 3-5). Surrounding these analyses are an introduction and a reader-response critique of salvation-historical approaches to Matthew's Gospel (chaps. 1-2) and a summary setting forth the results of the study (chap. 6).

The main conclusion Howel reaches will surprise no one acquainted with narrative criticism: the key link between the two horizons of Matthew's inclusive story is the "implied reader". What this means is that Matthew, as implied author and narrator, tells the past story of Jesus so as to address the actual readers (hearers) of his day through the "implied reader" encoded in the narrative and urge them to appropriate this story by assuming the role of the implied reader. With this observation, no one is likely to quarrel.

There are other aspects of Howell's study, however, that Matthean scholars will find less obvious and less congenial. Foremost among these is the programmatic assertion that the ideological point of view espoused by Matthew in his gospel narrative is that of "accepting or rejecting Jesus and his teaching" (159-160, 190, 235). If one reflects on it, Howell's formulation of Matthew's ideological point of view constitutes a major

reformulation of Matthew's own statement of his point of view, which is found in a word uttered by Jesus in 16,23. As expressed here, Matthew's ideological point of view is that of "thinking the things of God" as opposed to "thinking the things of humans". In reformulating the latter to read "accepting or rejecting Jesus", Howell undercuts the fundamental conviction undergirding the whole of Matthew's narrative, namely, that through encounter with Jesus, humans ultimately have to do with God (1,23; 11,27). In his missionary address to the disciples, the Matthean Jesus articulates this conviction this way: "...the one who receives me receives the one who has sent me" (10,40). By disregarding "God" and making "Jesus" the sole focus, Howell materially foreshortens and theologically distorts the ideological point of view that Matthew would claim for himself. Indeed, one gets the impression that Howell himself may not be unaware of this problem. To make it seem trivial, he declares in a footnote that the debate "whether it is God's or Jesus' ideological point of view that is normative in Matthew ... appears inconsequential" (188, n. 1). Not so! Had Matthew not clothed Jesus' words and deeds in the authority of God and rooted Jesus' life and ministry in the action of God, his story of Jesus would be without the dimension of ultimacy that, for him, makes it worth narrating. From Matthew's standpoint, it is impossible to formulate his ideological point of view and omit all reference to God.

On a related note, Howell criticizes the notion that the plot of Matthew's narrative turns on "conflict" (113). Still, among the great variety of plot forms "conflict" is one of the most common, and it is beyond dispute that Matthew tells a story of conflict. Had Howell not dismissed the factor of "conflict" so quickly, he could have been guided by it to a more nuanced and accurate understanding of Matthew's ideological point of view. At the human level in Matthew's narrative, Jesus enters into conflict primarily with Israel and the disciples. In Jesus' interaction with Israel, Matthew defines "thinking the things of God" not, strictly speaking, in terms of accepting or rejecting Jesus but in terms of "repentance": through encounter with John but especially Jesus, Israel is to turn to God (3,2; 4,17; 11,16-19 ["this generation"]; 11,20-24; 12,38-41 ["an evil and adulterous generation"]). In Jesus' interaction with the disciples, Matthew characterizes "thinking the things of God" as "following Jesus", which involves becoming like him, sons of God who do the will of God (4,18-22; 5,45; 7,21; 9,9; 10,24-25.38-39; 12,50; 13,38; 16,24-25; 19,20-22). In fact, in the case of the disciples "accepting Jesus" is not the problem; they do this from the outset. What is more, even the defection and restoration of the disciples are not described in terms of accepting or rejecting Jesus. The disciples defect because scripture has foretold this (e.g., 26,31) and they are inwardly divided (26,41). And the disciples are restored not because Jesus is accepted by them but because he gathers the scattered, reconciling them to himself (26,31-32; 28,7.10; 28,16).

In addition to Howell's misconstruction of Matthew's ideological point of view, other difficulties beset his literary-critical investigation. One of these has to do with the "reading" he provides of Matthew's narrative (115-158). Despite the emphasis he places on a sequential reading of

narrative (so as to enable the reader to “experience” the temporal movement and plot of the narrative; 90, 114), Howell’s own reading of Matthew is remarkably flat. By operating with the two themes of “promise/fulfillment” and “acceptance/rejection”, he systematically reduces the narrative events he interprets to these stereotyped alternatives. In so doing, he conveys little sense of either the development of Matthew’s plot or of the texture of his story or of the way he resolves the various conflicts. Moreover, because Howell’s reading is guided by an incorrect formulation of Matthew’s ideological point of view, it is suspect also for this reason.

Another difficulty attending Howell’s study is that his flat, reductionistic reading of Matthew’s narrative also has repercussions on the way in which he deals with the structure of the narrative. On the one hand, Howell unequivocally states that the “evangelist had to shape [the] events [of his narrative] into a coherent story with a *discernible beginning, middle and end*” (emphasis mine; 110-111). On the other hand, Howell explicitly disavows, as he is about to undertake his reading, any need to specify where one is to locate these “discernible” limits that mark the narrative’s beginning, middle and end (114). If Matthew “had” to shape his story, how can one properly read it by ignoring this shape?

This brings us to yet another difficulty, which concerns Howell’s approach to the reading process itself. It seems clear from Howell’s discussion of the implied reader and the act of reading that he would have the interpreter attempt a so-called “naïve reading” of Matthew’s narrative (e.g., 243-244). What this would entail is that the interpreter assume the first-century posture of the implied reader and hear Matthew’s story for the first time. Not only does Howell not discuss whether the latter is even possible but he also does not consider whether, or to what extent, Matthew’s narrative may not presuppose that the implied reader already knows the story of Jesus. If the latter is the case, it may well be that the proper task of narrative criticism is to focus not so much on the “telling” of Matthew’s narrative as on its “retelling”.

One additional matter calls for comment. In taking Howell’s book to hand, one is momentarily taken aback by the withering barrage of criticism that he lays down on the “redaction critics” (chap. 2). Soon, however, the reason for this becomes clear: in Howell’s view, the redaction critics have imputed to Matthew a theological construal of history that is alien to the world of his narrative and then read his Gospel as though it were written to promulgate this construal. As Howell sees it, therefore, the error of the redaction critics is that they have substituted an external theology of salvation history for Matthew’s ideological point of view (89-90). Indeed, the “periodization” the redaction critics claim they find in Matthew’s Gospel can in reality be accounted for in terms of Matthew’s mode of narration, to wit: because Matthew is a narrator who tells his story retrospectively, he necessarily looks back, from “his own vantage point in time”, upon the “past life of Jesus” and, prior to this, the “history of Israel” (71-75; 87-89). Accordingly, the so-called epochs redaction critics postulate (“time of Israel”, “time of Jesus”, and “time of the church”) actually arise from the manner in which Matthew tells his story.

In his discussion of the “redaction critics”, Howell overreaches himself on more than one count. He tends, for example, to treat the redaction critics monolithically, as though they all invest the term “salvation history” with the same loaded meaning he does (a “quasi-philosophical concept” that “developed in the twentieth century in a polemical direction against the proponents of kerygmatic theology”; 58, 75). Still, this is not the main issue. The main issue is whether Howell is correct (a) in categorically denying that Matthew evaluates time theologically and, in conjunction with this, (b) in asserting that salvation-historical “periodization” can be accounted for simply in terms of Matthew’s mode of narration.

The burden of proof in this debate still rests on Howell. In this particular book, he has not yet explained, on exegetical grounds, why the implied reader is not invited by Matthew, regardless of his mode of narration, to understand “time” in his narrative world as divided into periods and evaluated theologically, that is to say, eschatologically. Exegetically, Howell’s study leaves important questions unanswered. Why, precisely, is it not possible for one to understand Matthew’s ideological point of view as accommodating a theological construal of history? Why does a passage such as 11,13 not invite the implied reader to construe the history of Israel as the time of prophecy? Why do such passages as the formula quotations not suggest that Matthew regards the time following Jesus’ appearance as the eschatological time of fulfillment? And why does Matthew’s presentation of Jesus as the Messiah (Coming One), the Son of God, who both has come and will come not indicate that the time since Jesus’ coming is the time of the earthly and exalted Jesus? Perhaps one of the strengths of Howell’s monograph is that it has the potential to spark an important scholarly exchange.

Union Theological Seminary in Virginia
3401 Brook Road
Richmond, VA 23227 USA

Jack Dean KINGSBURY

R. T. FORTNA, *The Fourth Gospel and its Predecessor*. From Narrative Source to Present Gospel (Studies of the New Testament and its World). Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1989. xvi-332 p. 14,5 × 22. £17.95

Robert T. Fortna’s volume is his second major contribution to the study of John’s Gospel. There is no doubt that this book demonstrates scholarly ability and solid discipline as Fortna undertakes to prove his thesis that the fourth gospel depended on “the gospel of signs”.

In the earlier book, *The Gospel of Signs: A Reconstruction of the Narrative Source Underlying the Fourth Gospel* (SNTSMS 11; Cambridge 1970), he applied the form critical method to John’s Gospel (JG). His purpose was to prove not only that there were sources behind the present

form of JG which the 4th Evangelist (4E) made use of, but also that there was already a gospel; Fortna called it the "Gospel of Signs" (SG). His thesis was that in this gospel (SG) a series of narratives which featured the miracles of Jesus (SQ) and the passion-and-resurrection story (PQ) were already combined as a unified 'gospel'. According to Fortna, the aim of this gospel of signs was to testify to Jesus as the Messiah through his 'signs', including the last and greatest sign, his death-and-resurrection.

In his second book, as its subtitle suggests, Fortna attempts to apply the redaction critical method to the JG. Because of his thesis, however, he applies it twice, both to the JG and the SG. In Part I he examines twenty sections of the gospel to clarify the redaction of the SG and, then, the redaction of the 4E. And in Part II he summarizes how the theological motifs in SG were formulated into the distinctive Johannine Theology by the 4E under six headings: Messiahship, Sign and Faith, Salvation, The Death of Jesus, Eschatology and Community and Theological Locale.

As mentioned above, we appreciate his attempts to reconstruct the hypothetical gospel and to explain its nature and origin, and to clarify how and why the SG developed into the present form of the JG. If we accept his presupposition (SG = SQ + PQ), at many points his arguments are very persuasive and provide new insights and inspiration for Johannine students. However, I will offer some comments and critical evaluations on his work.

I am sceptical about his reconstruction of the hypothetical SG, especially about the unity of SQ and PQ. Fortna stresses that the redaction of SQ was made on the naïve Christological theme that the Messiahship of Jesus was testified to simply by his mighty miracles, namely 'signs'. And he argues that the redaction of PQ has the same theological concern, the exalted death of Jesus (of the "testimonia"). We might expect here some philological evidence and links between SQ and PQ by the hand of the SG redactor, but Fortna quickly moves on to the theological affinity between the two sections. Since neither philological nor redactional evidence has been presented, it seems risky to make theological motifs the standard of judgment, as Bultmann did when he proposed the theory of the ecclesiastical redactor. Not many would deny the existence of SQ behind JG, but a unified gospel, SG = SQ + PQ, is not self-evident.

The crucial problem which Fortna proposed is the possibility of PQ, the existence of a passion-and-resurrection story which has no redemptive motif. Theoretically, it is not impossible to suppose that at an early stage of the Christian *kerygmata* there was a theological focus that interpreted the cross of Jesus as the death of the righteous, and that a passion-and-resurrection story was compiled along with the theme of the exalted Messiah. It is true that in Luke-Acts we find the same theological motif; the miracles and wonders are simply and directly testimonies of Jesus' messiahship or the disciples' apostleship (Luke 5,26; 7,16; 9,43; 18,35; Acts 3,1-10; 9,32-35.36-42, etc.). There may also be the concept of the death of the righteous (Luke 23,47; Acts 3,14). In Luke-Acts the redemptive interpretation of the cross is presupposed in the Passion Story. Fortna has to prove the existence of such a passion story without the redemptive motif before he may legitimately suggest that the redemptive motif was an alien

element to the Johannine passion story before it was added at the latest stage of its composition.

For a long time it was taken for granted that, with the premise of the Marcan priority, the passion-and-resurrection story was based on the theological theme of humiliation and redemption according to the *paradosis* in 1 Cor 15,3f: "For I handed on to you as of first importance what I in turn had received: that Christ died for our sins in accordance with the scriptures, and that he was buried, and that he was raised on the third day in accordance with scriptures, and he appeared to Cephas, then to the twelve". It is true that in this *paradosis* the testimony of the scriptures is emphasized, but it is also true that the redemption motif is right at the heart of the *kerygma*.

In the case of Phil 2,6-11, it was obvious (to some) that Paul inserted the redemptive motif, "even death on a cross", into the original hymn to the humiliated Christ. On the other hand it is difficult to prove that the first clause of the *kerygma* (1 Cor 15,3b) was a later addition to the oldest *paradosis*.

If Fortna is right, there was a gospel, perhaps prior to the Marcan Gospel, which had the passion-and-resurrection story focus not on the humiliation and redemption but on the glory of the Cross. Or, more properly, Fortna is saying that there was even a type of passion-and-resurrection story based on the *kerygma* which originally had its center simply on the resurrection, namely the glorification of Jesus, and the death on the cross was merely a necessary presupposition of the resurrection. PQ was that type of the story, and 4E was the first one in his church who placed the emphasis on the "passion" to bring to light the redemptive meaning of Jesus' death.

This, then, would mean that in the first fifty or sixty years of the early church there were two streams of Christian circles (churches); one had its center in the redemptive interpretation of the Cross and the other in the glorious interpretation of the Cross. Such a dichotomy fits well with the conflict between Paul and his opponents in the congregation at Corinth. Mark was the outcome of the first stream and the SG might be of the second. And 4E united these two streams into one and the "early catholic church" ("Frühkatholizismus") might have followed this one. The more such a Hegelian pattern, thesis-antithesis-synthesis, is attractive to explain history, the more we have to be cautious.

It is true that in the Fourth Gospel we find a tension between the beloved disciple, whose witness is the authority of this Gospel, and Peter. And it is probable that the Johannine church was different from the churches which depended on the authority of Peter or the Twelve Apostles. But it is difficult to suppose any hostility between the beloved disciple and Peter or between the Johannine church and the Petrine church as far as the text of the JG is concerned.

That in his redaction 4E introduced the pre-gnostic *Denkweise* and its material seems to be the decisive element that changed the nature of the SQ and PQ to form the JG.

A second question has to do with Fortna's treatment of an eschatological scheme. According to his interpretation, both SQ and PQ, and therefore SG, have no eschatological concern, while 4E introduced the eschatological scheme into the gospel, JG.

Fortna is right when he says that the nature of "sign" itself is to prove Jesus' divine sonship here and now by way of a miracle. But it is unlikely that SQ and PQ were lacking the eschatological perspective of "already" and "not yet". It is more likely that in the Jesus-tradition the concept of his divine sonship was closely connected with the Messiah from the very beginning, and that a "sign" was a messianic event, since the miracle stories of Jesus were closely connected with the Old Testament and the Jewish messianic expectation. Fortna himself rejects the idea that the Hellenistic *theios-anēr* was responsible for the miracle stories of Jesus. Thus, it would seem that the eschatological scheme was potentially laid in the sign-story itself. Here again, the nature of traditions in SQ becomes ambiguous in Fortna's argument.

Tokyo Union Theological Seminary
3-10-30 Osawa
Mitaka, Tokyo 181
Japan

Kikuo MATSUNAGA

Harold W. ATTRIDGE, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (Hermeneia).
Philadelphia, Fortress Press, 1989. XXVII-433 p.

Hebrews has unique importance in the New Testament. It contains the fullest exposition of the sacrificial death of Christ in the literature of earliest Christianity. It also appears to stem from a stratum of the early church which is distinct from the churches represented by the other New Testament books. But it is frustrating to scholars, because all the basic details of date and authorship and place and destination are unknown and remain highly disputed, and the author's style of writing is so ambiguous and leaves so many questions open that there is no agreement on what should be the proper basis of interpretation. For the non-specialist reader it is equally problematical, because it both attracts and repels at the same time. It has superb and memorable passages, some of which have entered the liturgy, or even have become household words in Christian circles. But the argument is notoriously difficult to follow, and the details about animal sacrifice can be very distasteful to many modern people.

The *Hermeneia* series is of course directed mainly to professionals and highly literate readers. But it is from such well-informed people that work at a more popular level must begin. This fine commentary by Harold Attridge is indeed very informative, and admirably fulfills the aims of the series. The bibliographical and other technical detail has the fulness which is possible only in a major commentary. Sources mentioned in the text are frequently quoted in the copious footnotes in the original language,

accompanied by an English translation in every case. As a specialist in Greco-Roman philosophy, Hellenistic Judaism and Gnosticism, Attridge has been able to draw on a great fund of relevant ancient literature. In the body of the commentary all problems are considered with great fairness, with ample attention to opposing views. There is no doubt that this book will be a major resource for all serious students of Hebrews for a long time to come.

The interpretation of Hebrews in this commentary largely follows prevailing views, but also marks the beginning of change. This is evident from the new caution which constantly appears in the discussion of disputed issues. The date is left at any time between 60 and 100 CE. This at least leaves open the possibility of a date before the destruction of the temple, which few recent commentators have allowed, though R. M. Wilson in the *New Century Bible* urged that it should be reconsidered (1987). In my view it is overdue to be reinstated, but this has been prevented by the critical orthodoxy that Hebrews is dependent on, or at least in dialogue with, incipient Gnosticism. Here again Attridge is cautious, acknowledging that there is likely to be contact with a variety of contemporary currents of thought, but refusing to see any single special influence upon the author. In fact he finds the nearest parallels of thought in 1 Peter, and these are listed in detail. The connection of Hebrews with Rome is also regarded as an open possibility.

The same caution appears in his estimate of the situation of the readers. He agrees that they are under some kind of external pressure, but after listing several possibilities he is unwilling to choose one in particular. In fact he even wonders whether the author was close enough to the circumstances of the readers to know what the trouble really was about. He sees this pressure as accompanying, but not necessarily causing, a waning of their Christian convictions. The bracing call to faith in the final chapters goes beyond renewal of belief to practical consequences, urging the readers to emulate the example of Jesus, who was made perfect through suffering.

All this is fine as far as it goes, but unfortunately such a tentative approach is bound to fail to account for the extreme urgency of Hebrews. As I have tried to show in an article on "The Rhetorical Structure of Hebrews" (*NTS* 35 [1989] 382-406), Hebrews is first and foremost a work of persuasion, and betrays the greatest anxiety on the part of the author. It is inconceivable that he was ignorant of the situation of the readers, which he evidently regarded as extremely dangerous. The possibility of falling away from Christian faith is treated as if it is real.

It is precisely at this point that the modern interest in the rhetorical models of the ancient world proves to be misleading. It is easy to show that the author of Hebrews was well trained in the art of rhetoric, which was the main constituent of literary education in Greco-Roman society. But this observation often carries with it the unconscious assumption that rhetorical features are merely ornamental. This assumption afflicts the great commentary of C. Spicq in *Sources bibliques* (1952-3), in which much relevant detail is given. It cannot be said that Attridge has escaped the same tendency. On the contrary it needs to be asserted that the rhetorical features

are never merely ornamental, but are used precisely for their persuasive effect. The author has mastered the technique of using words to bring about change in the readers, who no doubt would not read the letter to themselves as we do today, but would listen to it as it was read out loud. As the author could not be present to read it himself (13,19), the emotional effect could not be left to the reader's declamatory skill, but must be incorporated in the literary composition of the letter. The result is that even a simple reading of it has a tremendously powerful impact.

Once this fact is grasped, several of the problems of Hebrews begin to fall away. Attridge complains that the writing of Hebrews, immensely skilled as it is, can often be frustratingly ambiguous. One of the places where this is noted is the exhortation in 13,9-16, where it seems as if the author is referring to the eucharist, but it is by no means certain that this is the case, and many commentators even suppose that he is opposed to the eucharist on principle. As I see it, this is just one of several places where the author uses a studied allusiveness deliberately. He knows that the readers will understand what he means, because the matter is common ground between them. Whereas he has to speak very plainly in the main argument of the letter, which is new teaching and acknowledged to be hard to understand (5,11), when he is referring to matters which are not in dispute he can strengthen the rapport between himself and the readers by allusive touches. It is the language of the in-group. One of the characteristics of this kind of language is ironical understatement. For this reason when such language is detected, it should be given a maximizing interpretation. From this point of view the reference to the eucharist in 13,9-16 can be considered highly probable.

Recognition of the practical purpose of the rhetoric of Hebrews also explains variations in the author's attitude to the readers, almost amounting to inconsistency. The suggestion that they may be exposed to temptation is so mild when it appears in 2,18 and 4,15 that the harsh words about apostasy in 6,4-8 may seem unfair and exaggerated. In fact they represent the author's real fear concerning the readers, and the earlier references have been part of a process of preparing the way for this exposure of the actual danger which threatens the congregation. Here it is pleasing to note that Attridge correctly observes that, though the rigorism of the words should not be minimized, they cannot be interpreted correctly unless the author's rhetorical aims are recognized. Attridge also perceives that the change of tone in verse 9 constitutes the rhetorical device of *captatio benevolentiae*, intended to have persuasive effect. It is perhaps significant that all the parallels given in the footnotes are taken from the New Testament epistles rather than secular literature.

It is already clear that a distinction has to be made between the teaching which can be regarded as non-controversial from the point of view of the readers and the innovations which the author feels bound to make in order to cope with the dangerous situation which has evoked the letter in the first place. This has a bearing on the sources of the author's thought as well as the ways in which he presents it. Attridge rightly affirms the traditional character of much of the opening christological statement in the

first chapter, and is favourably disposed to the suggestion that it is derived from an early Christian hymn. But the phraseology referring to the atonement in 1,3 ('when he had made purification for sins') is very unusual and demands explanation. Attridge accepts it as part of the hymn on formal grounds, seeing that the christological hymns normally include some reference to the incarnation or humiliation of Jesus before mentioning his exaltation. This may be so as far as the form of the model is concerned, but it does not prove that these precise words were used to express the idea, as the author of Hebrews can have substituted his own expression. This becomes almost certain when it is observed that the words are a literary allusion to Exod 30,10, which is actually concerned with the Day of Atonement. Attridge quotes the verse according to the Septuagint, but astonishingly does not see that the use of this particular expression is a subtle device to prepare the readers for the highly creative and innovative use of the model of the Day of Atonement in the central and crucial argument of the whole letter in chapter 9. Moreover, it is in this central part of the letter that it becomes clear that the issue which has brought the addressees to the brink of apostasy is bound up with the problem of purification for sins, not mere slackness, and such external pressure as forms a relevant factor in the situation is related to the continuing attraction of contemporary Jewish atonement practices.

Similar considerations apply to the figure of Melchizedek. He belongs entirely to the central chapters, and is first introduced by means of exegesis of the christological Psalm 110 (5,5-10). In spite of this it is often assumed that these verses are based on another christological hymn, implying that speculations concerning Melchizedek had already been applied to Jesus and were available to the author. Attridge rightly refutes these assumptions, and allows at most some influence of contemporary Jewish speculations about Melchizedek, such as those of Philo or just possibly the Qumran scroll. I wish that he had also seen more clearly that the author's resort to this figure has been prompted by the need to find a convincing argument that Jesus is genuinely the eschatological priest, so that the idea is not merely metaphorical. But this comes from taking the main argument as an indictment of the Levitical system of priesthood and sacrifice, as is so often assumed by commentators on Hebrews, whereas in reality it is an assertion of the temporary nature and inferior value of the conditions of the old covenant by comparison with the sacrifice of the new covenant, which opens the eschatological era and has lasting efficacy and brings the divine plan of salvation to completion. It is precisely because the era of the old covenant is passing away that it is so urgent to convince the addressees of this fact. In this connection I should like to have seen more stress on the notion of completeness in the excellent excursus on 'perfection', as this is really the fundamental idea in the use of this word-group in Hebrews.

Though it is clear that I go beyond Attridge in a number of issues, I think that he has done a great service by his cautiousness, especially in relation to the assumptions of recent critical orthodoxy. Though he handles

external evidence fully and with great assurance, he constantly reminds one that Hebrews must be understood within its own terms of reference and should be allowed to speak for itself. Thus this great commentary provides a sure foundation for further studies. It is in every way a notable achievement.

The Friary
Hillfield
GB-Dorchester (Dorset)
DT2 7BE

Barnabas LINDARS SSF

Varia

Francis I. ANDERSEN—A. Dean FORBES, *The Vocabulary of the Old Testament*. Rome, Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1989. VIII-721 p. 23,3 × 27,8. Lit. 73.500

Das vorliegende Werk ist ein in der Hebraistik neuartiges Arbeitsinstrument und bietet, höchst gedrängt, eine Fülle an Information, A–F beabsichtigen "to provide easy and accurate access to vocabulary distribution" und schlüsseln das gesamte hebräische und aramäische Vokabular des Alten Testaments auf der Basis des Codex Leningradensis in mehreren umfangreichen und übersichtlichen Tabellen und durch Indices auf. Auf nur 18 Seiten führen sie sehr kurz in die Anlage und die Problematik der Tabellen ein; diese sind so angelegt und untereinander verknüpft, daß Studenten sich leicht darin zurechtfinden können.

Die erste und kürzeste Tabelle: "Grammatical Categories" ist am interessantesten, weil sie am meisten Fakten bietet, die sich mit anderen Hilfsmitteln nicht oder nur in langwieriger Suche eruieren lassen. Sie gibt u.a. an, wie oft Präpositionen (insgesamt, dann einzeln für die acht häufigsten einsilbigen Präpositionen), Konjunktionen, Artikel, selbständige und enklitische Pronomina, Adverbien, Verben (nach Stämmen und Verbformen differenziert), Nomina (im status absolutus, constructus, determiniert und suffigiert) im AT insgesamt, in der Tora, Jos-2 Kön, Propheten, Ps + Ijob + Spr, den "übrigen" Schriftwerken, in den einzelnen Büchern des AT, in den Pentateuchquellen (nach Eißfeldts Hexateuch-Synopse von 1922!), in Jes 1–39, 40–55, 56–66 und den fünf Psalmenbüchern vorkommen, und zwar nach der absoluten Zahl der Belege sowie, um einen schnellen Vergleich zu ermöglichen nach der Häufigkeit, mit der sie in einem je entsprechenden Text von 10.000 Wörtern anzutreffen sind bzw. wären. Diese Tabelle regt zu aufschlußreichen Beobachtungen an. Beispiel: A–F führen getrennt die Artikel an, die sich konsonantenschriftlich am ׀, und diejenigen, die sich nur an der Vokalisierung erkennen lassen (Unschärfen der Erhebung sind in dieser zweiten Gruppe unvermeidbar). Zieht man die Zahlen pro 10.000 Wörter heran ergibt sich: Soweit nur die Punktatoren den

Artikel signalisieren, sind sich Pentateuch (209), Propheten (235) und Ps + Ijob + Spr (197) ziemlich ähnlich, dagegen divergieren sie außerordentlich in den konsonantenschriftlich nachweisbaren Artikeln: 932-668-162. Während für Genesis das Verhältnis der nur vokalisiert zu den konsonantenschriftlichen Artikeln 137 zu 741 beträgt, lautet es für Spr 182 zu 69, dagegen für Psalmen relativ ausgeglichen 207 zu 196. Schon dieser kurze Blick macht wahrscheinlich, daß diese Unterschiede nur z.T. stilistisch zu erklären, z.T. aber den Punktatoren anzulasten sind, die, womöglich, nach Prosaregeln punktiert haben. Das sind wichtige, wenn auch noch sehr rohe Informationen. Das Verdienst, sie bereitgestellt zu haben, wird nicht geschmälert durch gegenläufige Anmerkungen: Nicht einmal entfernt kann man sich z.B. beim gegenwärtigen Stand der hebräischen Grammatiken vorstellen, wie umfangreich und in welcher Weise zusammengesetzt die Wörtergruppe ist, die A-F als Adverbien zählen; auch der Weg über den "General Index" und seine englischen Äquivalente unter "adverbs" scheint nicht zu einer befriedigenden Antwort zu führen. Unter den Verbformen in dieser Liste führen A-F "ו-past" und "ו-future" auf, "ו-past" wird aber auf S. 5 als *wa* = *yiqtul* erläutert; bedeutet das, daß *w-qatal-x*-Formen für generellen Sachverhalt der Vergangenheit als "ו-future" eingeordnet oder gar nicht mitgezählt sind? Diese Beispiele zeigen: Zwar mag man sich auf das im Vorwort von den Autoren, denen diese Probleme vertraut sind, angekündigte Werk "Parts of Speech in Biblical Hebrew: Their Taxonomy, Incidence, and Ordering" für zahlreiche ähnliche Zweifelsfälle vertrösten; der wissenschaftlichen Kommunikation, der Nachprüfbarkeit der behaupteten Resultate und dem freien Umgang mit den Daten wäre es aber sehr viel dienlicher, wenn A-F die ihren Statistiken zugrundeliegende Datenbank samt den Abfrageroutinen ebenfalls veröffentlichten und den übrigen Alttestamentlern zur Verfügung stellten. Die Aussagekraft der auf die Eißfeldtschen Pentateuchquellen-Zuweisungen bezogenen Belegzahlen darf man als sehr gering einstufen.

In der zweiten und umfangreichsten Tabelle: "The Vocabulary" führen A-F mit laufender Nummer alphabetisch alle lexikalischen Einheiten des AT auf; sie geben jeweils nur eine Bedeutung, die Wortartbestimmung, die Zahl der Belege sowie die ersten 40 Fundorte an, wodurch 91% aller Lexikoneinträge vollständig erfaßt sind; am Ende verweisen sie jeweils darauf, wo diese Wörter im Lexikon von Brown-Driver-Briggs und in den Konkordanzen Mandelkerns und Even-Shoshans (hier sind die Seitenangaben angesichts verschiedener Ausgaben mit abweichender Paginierung wenig sinnvoll) zu finden sind. Lemmatisierungsprobleme, kontroverse Aufspaltungen in homonyme Wurzeln, Kurzbemerkungen zu morphologischen oder semantischen Eigenheiten werden in einem eigenen Anmerkungs teil behandelt, der z.B. *HALAT* nicht berücksichtigt. Diese Tabelle liefert kaum Informationen, die nicht bereits in anderen Handbüchern vorliegen, präsentiert allerdings die ausgewählten Fakten so, daß sie auf einem Blick zu erfassen sind. Ob die Suche nach schwierigen oder seltenen Wörtern in den Lexika und Konkordanzen wirklich so "frustrierend" ist und ob die Querverweise zu diesen Hilfsmitteln, die A-F hier bieten, von den Studierenden wirklich systematisch genutzt werden, muß die Praxis erweisen. Soweit

A-F's Belegzahlen von andernorts genannten Zahlen differieren, mögen sie exakter sein, doch läßt sich das nur schwer nachprüfen.

Die dritte Tabelle: "Frequent Vocabulary" gibt von allen mindestens 20 mal im AT genannten Wörtern die Belegzahlen nach Büchern und Büchergruppen (entsprechend Tabelle 1) an. Sie ist hilfreich, da sie einen schnellen ersten Überblick über die Verteilung eines Wortes einschließlich der Bücher und Büchergruppen, in denen es fehlt, ermöglicht. Soweit sie zur Überprüfung des typischen Vokabulars von größeren Texten und Büchern dienen soll, muß erst getestet werden, ob sich die Untergrenze von mindestens 20 Belegen bewährt; das scheint eher fraglich. Die vierte Tabelle: "Verb Formations" zeigt, wie oft jedes Verb im AT in jedem Stamm belegt ist. Wie auch in anderen Teilen des Buches wird epigraphisch bezeugtes Althebräisch nicht ausgewertet. Drei Indices geben nach der Reihe der Erwähnungen in Brown-Driver-Briggs, Mandelkern und Even-Shoshan die Verweise auf die laufenden Nummern in A-F's Vokabelverzeichnis. Vier weitere Indices zu Gottes-, Volks-, Personen- und Ortsnamen sowie der allgemeine Index führen alphabetisch alle englischen Bezeichnungen und deren Erwähnung im hebräischen "Vocabulary" auf.

Insgesamt ist dieses Werk A-F's wohl nicht als Instrument der Forschung, sondern als ein sehr anspruchsvolles und vielseitiges Hilfsmittel gedacht, um englischsprachige Studenten an die lexikalische Arbeit im AT heranzuführen. Als solches ist es sehr zu begrüßen.

Keplerstraße, 17
D-7400 Tübingen 1

Walter GROß

André CAQUOT-Jean-Michel DE TARRAGON-Jesús-Luis CUNCHILLOS, *Textes ougaritiques*. Tome II: Textes religieux, rituels, correspondance (Littératures anciennes du Proche-Orient 14). Paris, Les Editions du Cerf, 1989. 479 p. 12,5 × 19,5

Der jetzt vorliegende zweite Band von *TO* setzt in erfreulicher Weise den ersten fort. Das Schema der Darbietung mit einer Übersetzung ohne Originaltext und zahlreichen kritischen sowie erklärenden Fußnoten hat sich aufs Beste bewährt und ist deshalb zu Recht auch in *TO II* beibehalten worden. Im Gegensatz zu den mythisch- und episch-poetischen Texten von *TO I* weisen die jetzt behandelten andere, zum Teil sogar größere Schwierigkeiten auf. Die kleinen Texteinheiten religiösen und rituellen Inhalts sowie besonders die Briefe werden von einer inneren Logik bestimmt, die bei weitem unzugänglicher ist als der Handlungsverlauf breiter epischer und mythischer Texte. Bereits das Wagnis einer Deutung dieser Textsorten stellt sich als eine beträchtliche Leistung heraus.

Im ersten Teil ("Textes religieux", 7-123) weisen A. Caquot ("Fragments mythologiques", 17-50, "Tablettes mytho-magiques", 51-100, und "Vestiges du rituel et du mythe des mânes", 101-123) und J.-M. de

Tarragon ("Les rituels", 125-238) öfters auf den schlechten und fragmentarischen Erhaltungszustand der Texte und das häufige Auftreten von *hapax legomena* hin. Letztere erlauben zumeist nur eine hypothetische Übersetzung, so z. B. S. 19, "aléatoire", und S. 20, "conjecture". In den gut ausgewogenen Fußnoten dieses Teils werden reichlich gleichwertige Deutungsmöglichkeiten und Auffassungen anderer Autoren beigebracht. Von unsicheren Textrekonstruktionen und -korrekturen wird erfreulich wenig Gebrauch gemacht. Es gereicht den beiden Forschern zur Ehre, daß sie von wenigen Ausnahmen abgesehen ein oberflächliches Parallelisieren mit dem Alten Testament unterlassen und die ugaritischen Texte nicht von der Bibel her erklären. Dem grammatischen Sachverhalt wird in Teil I zumeist genügend Rechnung getragen. So wird die Frage des inneren Passivs berücksichtigt (85 mit Anm. 262, "qu'on gave") und auch der Unterschied zwischen Langform und Kurzform (Apokopat), der die Modi prägt, genau beachtet.

In Teil II, "Correspondance" (239-421) interpretiert J.-L. Cunchillos neunzehn Briefe. Seine Textrekonstruktionen und Interpretationen sind nicht immer von der inneren Logik der Brieftexte unterbaut. Wilde Phantasien einiger Autoren werden allzu ernst genommen. Die Einleitungen (z. B. 241-267 und 363-386) sind verhältnismäßig zu lang und die Fußnoten zu zahlreich sowie zu ausführlich, öfters sogar nichtssagend. Die häufigen Verweise ("Voir introduction sous...", z. B. 350) und die vielen Wiederholungen ermüden, wenn es z. B. 397, 399, 404, 412-413 und 416 gar keinen Text mehr gibt. Bibeltexte werden unverzagt in die profane Prosa der ugaritischen Korrespondenz hineingelesen und der Grammatik wird nicht immer Genüge getan.

Die in TO II zusammengefaßten Texte weisen eine Fülle von religions- und kulturgeschichtlichen Problemen auf, die unausgesetzte Beachtung verdienen. Zugleich stellen sie uns auch vor bedeutsame grammatische Fragen, von denen im folgenden wenigstens einige herausgegriffen werden sollen.

S. 35, N. 77 (1.92,33): *ttgr*, "forme réfléchie": in der Tat *Gt-ngr* = *tittagir* < *tintagir*.

S. 42, N. 91 (1.96,1): *šnwt:nwy*, Š-Pf. 3f. sg. ist unmöglich: *šanwayat* = *šnwyt*; am besten G-Pf. 3f. sg. von *šnw* (cf. 1.1,III,18 und 1.3,IV,33: lc. sg.) = *šanawat*.

S. 50 (1.101,14): *yšq*, "on verse"; in der Tat G-Ipf. 3m. pl., Apokopat (Jussiv?) von *yšq* = *yašiqū* (idem S. 154-155, KTU 1.41,10+12: *y'db*, *ytk*).

S. 60 (RIH 78/20,18); *bt u bu al tbi*: eher "das Haus, weh, du sollst (es) bestimmt nicht betreten", mit einem paronomastischen Inf. abs. *bu* = *bā'u* beim Jussiv *tbi* = *tabū* ', cf. 1.16,VI,3: *bu tbu*.

S. 66 + N. 184 (1.82,9): "ma mère a bondi/attaqué": *nītt* und *īt* sind G-Part. f. sg. = *nāṭītat/ālītu* < *ālytu* vom Stamm *ly* ohne -a-Einschub. Pf. ist unmöglich: *ālayat* = *lyt*.

S. 68, N. 203: sogar das Neue Testament wird von einigen Autoren in die ugaritischen Texte hineininterpretiert!

S. 74, N. 227 (1.114,5): *yqtqt*: in der Tat R-*qt* = *yaqatqit*.

S. 77 (1.114,28): "quand il est guéri": KTU liest *km**. *trpa*, unverträglich mit 3m. sg. (*yrp'*).

S. 90, N. 277 (1.100,62): *bnwth*: die Deutung des Autors überzeugt nicht im Lichte von *bny bnwt* = *bāniyu banūwāti*.

S. 93 + N. 292 (1.100,72): *w uba* ist in der Tat ein Finalsatz mit Subjunktiv '*ubū'a*'.

S. 97, N. 298: in 1.14,I,12 und 1.103,13 ist vielmehr einen Stamm *ypq* = *yapaqa* (Pf.) / *yapiqu* (Ipf.) anzusetzen.

S. 108 (1.161,15): "que pleure": ein Jussiv (3m. sg. = *ybk* = *yabkī* < *yabkiy*) stimmt nicht mit der Langform *ybkky* überein. Zugleich mit *ydm'* (Z. 14) und *ybl'* (Z. 16) ist einen Jussiv 3m. pl. für den Impersonalis anzusetzen ("man beweine") = *yabkiyū*.

S. 110 + N. 339 (1.161,30): *tqdš* ist in der Tat D-Jussiv 2m. pl. = *taqaddišū*.

S. 113 (1.108,1): "Voici que boit", eine Behauptungsform, also Indikativ (*yšty* = *yīštayu*), ist unvereinbar mit der Kurzform *yšt* = *šty*, G-Inf. 3m. sg., Jussiv = *yīštē* < *yīštay*.

S. 116 + N. 356-357 (1.108,8): *di dit* wird in KTU korrigiert als *di* (*diy*). *dit*, etwa "der fliegende Vogel". *diy* ist dann ein G-Part. aktiv m. sg. = *dā'iy* vom Stamm *d'y/w*, vielleicht Substantiv für "Vogel" im allgemeinen. *dit* ist allerdings ein G-Part. aktiv f. sg. = *dā'itu* < *dā'iytu* (ohne -a-Einschub); es kann keineswegs ein Pf. 3f. sg. *da'ayat* = *dayt* enthalten. Auch *di* kann unmöglich einen Inf. abs. ergeben: *da'āw/yu* > *da'ā* = *da* oder > *da'ō* = *du*. Möglicherweise ist *di* ein aus Versehen nicht getilgter Schreibfehler. *rhpt*, "planant", enthält aber kein Part., sondern ein D-Pf. 3f. sg. = *rahḥapat* in Anbetracht des offensichtlichen Imperfekts 1c. sg. *arḥp* = *arahhip-* (1.8,IV,21).

S. 120: Abraham ist eine Figur der Genesis, die sonst nicht in den ugaritischen Texten auftritt.

S. 123 (1.124,12): "pour recevoir": *lqh* = *laqāḥu* ist in der Tat ein Inf. abs. zur Bezeichnung eines (asyndetischen) Finalsatzes. *ymḡ* (Z. 10) ist eine Kurzform: "que vienne" (Jussiv) oder Narrativ-Präteritum, = *yamḡi* < *yamḡiy*.

S. 143, die vier oberen Zeilen: eine angemessene Warnung gegen das Hineininterpretieren des Alten Testaments in die ugaritischen Texte.

S. 145 ff. (1.40, z. B. Z. 6-7): *ī'nf'y/nkt nkt*, "que nous offrons/abattions": es handelt sich hier tatsächlich um asyndetische Relativsätze (mit Subjunktiv).

S. 146 f. (1.40, z. B. Z. 11,14,15...): "vous ferez la purification = *thṭu* (m.)/*thṭin* (f.): diese Formen sind Apokopate, so daß eine futurisch-indikativische Übersetzung nicht in Frage kommt; wahrscheinlich gilt "vous ferez" als Jussiv.

S. 147-148 (1.40,26 + 35): "on amène/on reprend": *šqrb* und *tb* sind eigentlich Imperative (m. pl.).

S. 165 (1.46,11): ein Impersonalis "on abat" (Jussiv) genügt (idem S. 189: 1.109,4).

S. 175 (1.91,1): eigentlich "Wein, den man auslieferte".

S. 187 (1.106,28): "on sort les denrées": *tṣu*, G-*yš'*, ist intransitiv. Vielleicht folgt ein adverbialer Akkusativ, "mit den Nahrungsmitteln".

S. 196 (1.111,23): *mt* ist aber männlich, kann nicht das Subjekt von *tšlm* sein; eher "bis zum Tode (-h) lasse man fürwahr Frieden herabsteigen über uns". *tšlm* = *šlm*, D-Jussiv 3m. pl. = *tašallimū*.

S. 207 + N. 193 (1.119,9): *tnrr* ist ein L-Jussiv 3m. pl. (Impersonalis) von *n(y)r* (faktitiv) = *tanārīrū*, etwa "man verbrenne".

S. 210 (1.119,28): *al tdy* ist in der Tat ein (vereinzelter) G-Kohortativ 2m. sg. von *ydy* in einem unabhängigen Wunschsatz = *ta(d)diya*. Ebenso korrekt sind die Übersetzungen "nous acquitterons" = *nmlu* (Z. 31) und "il éloignera" = *ydy* (z. 35), beide Indikativ-Futurum, D-1c. pl. = *namal-li'u* / G-3m. sg. = *ya(d)diyu*.

S. 215 + N. 211-214 (1.127,29-31): tatsächlich sind keine Dämonen im Text erwähnt. Ich interpretiere jetzt *tuhd* als gewöhnlichen Impersonalis von *ʾhd*, G-Ipf. 3m. pl. = *taʾhudū*, ein einzelner Subjunktiv in einem Konditionalsatz. Oder es besteht die Möglichkeit, daß *qrt* gar nicht "Stadt" bedeutet, sondern ein weibliches Nomen vom Stamm *qry* enthält (*qārītu*?), etwa "Geschick, Schicksal, Not". Diese Deutung löst zwei Probleme auf einmal. Erstens die Unregelmäßigkeit eines Subjunktivs in einem konditionalen Vordersatz (*tuhd* ist einfach 3 f. sg. = *taʾhud(u)*). Zweitens die ungewöhnliche Inversion Objekt-Verb(+ Subjekt), wo sonst die normale Folge Subjekt-Verb befolgt wird. Darüber hinaus ergibt sich ein perfekter *parallelismus membrorum* in Z. 29: "Wenn das Schicksal zugreift, wenn der Tod die Leute verdirbt...". *yʾ* gehört dem Stamm *ʾ(w)l*, nicht *ʾly*, so daß wieder ein Apokopat in einem Bedingungssatz vermieden wird = *yaʾūl(u)*. In Z. 31 bietet "il examinera l'avenir" eine ausgezeichnete Übersetzung; die zeitliche Interpretation vom *mrḥqm* (*ma/iqta!*) verträgt sich völlig mit der üblichen Bedeutung von *hdy*, "sehen". Ich ändere folglich meine frühere Meinung (OLA 27 [Leuven 1988] 165), indem ich doch auf dem Finalsatz mit Subjunktiv *yaḥdiya* bestehe: "damit er die Zukunft deutet". Zugleich wird der biblische Sündenbock ausgeklammert.

S. 231 (RIH 77/2B,19): *w al tšu [x] yšu*: es könnte sich um einen paronomastischen Inf. abs. *yašā'u* handeln beim Jussiv 2m. pl. *taši'ū*.

S. 260 ff.: "*qatala* optatif": diese Bestätigung des prekativen Perfekts entspricht den Theorien über den Gebrauch von *qtl*. S. 261-262 hat Cunchillos völlig Recht betreffs der Vernachlässigung der syntaktischen Studien im Ugaritischen.

S. 273 + N. 10 (2.4,21): *w ytn ilm bdhm*: eine Übersetzung "und er gebe die Götterstatuen in ihre Hände" vermeidet die Inversion Verb-Subjekt für Subjekt(+ Verb)-Objekt.

S. 277 + N. 9 (2.10,5-8a): eine Übersetzung "ich habe gehört von T. und K., daß wir geschlagen sind" hat weniger Sinn als etwa "Bezüglich T. und K.: ich habe gehört die Schläge, die sie erlitten haben". *ḥti* kann niemals ein Inf. abs. (*ḥatā'u* = *ḥtu*) sein; es ist ein Nomen im *casus obliquus* plural, Status cstr. (vor einem Relativsatz) = *ḥata'ī*. *nḥtu* = N-Pf. 3m. pl. = *naḥta'ū*; ein angeblicher Indikativ 1c. pl. entspricht weder dem durch den Bezugssatz geforderten Subjunktiv, noch den zeitlichen Verhältnissen (Vorzeitigkeit). Idem S. 278, Z. 8b-11.

S. 279 (2.10,11-14): die belletristische Übersetzung scheitert an der Verknüpfung eines weiblichen Subjekts *yd* mit einer männlichen Verbform

ʾz = 'azza, G-Pf. 3m. sg. Besser wäre "Und die Hand der Götter 'ist' hier, da Môṯ (+ Mem-encliticum) sehr stark ist; wenn sie... (*ntkp* = N-Pf. 3m. pl.), antworte dann".

S. 284 + N. 9 (2.11,13-14): "Je me suis déjà reposé" ist sinnlos. Besser wäre "(Hier bei uns geht alles gut) und auch bin ich gesund / wohlauf (= *nhṯ*)". Hiob hilft da nicht weiter.

S. 290 + N. 13 (2.13,16-17): *l tqṯ*, "mes affaires sont terminées". Wenn von G-*qṯy*, "finir, terminer", abgeleitet, liegt hier ein Übergang von transitiver zu intransitiver Bedeutung vor. Das akkadische *qatû* heißt G "zum Ende kommen", D "zu Ende bringen" (AHw, 911-912). Der Apokopat (2f. sg.) widerspricht übrigens einem Resultativ. Besser wäre "und möchtest du meine Worte doch zur Erfüllung bringen", mit *tqṯ* = *qṯy*, D-Ipf. 2f. sg., Jussiv = *taqattî* < *taqattiyî*.

S. 295 + N. 13 (2.14,11-13): mit Recht stellt der Autor hier einen Kompletivsatz mit Inf. fest, i. c. einen Finalsatz: "er bitte Tryl, daß sie dem König meinen Nahmen nennt", buchstäblich "um zu nennen". Da eine Absicht vorliegt, kommt ein Objektsatz nicht in Frage. Merkwürdigerweise wird der Inf. abs. *rgm* = *ragāmu* mittels der Konjunktion *p* mit dem Hauptverb *yšal* verbunden, nicht asyndetisch oder mit Waw. Z. 16-18 liegt derselbe Tatbestand vor außer dem Waw statt *p*; *ṭṭb* ist ein Š-Inf. abs. von *ṭ(w)b* = *ṭuṭābu*. Die Entdeckung dieser zweifachen Hypotaxis ist ein großer Verdienst des Autors.

S. 298, Noten 9 und 15: *ky* und *by* sind Schreibungen mit *mater lectio-nis* = *kī* / *bī*. Das beweist *umy* in Z. 6 als Subjekt im Nominativ = 'ummī.

S. 299 + N. 18 (2.16,10-11): hier liegt die wohl hartnäckigste Täuschung in der Ugaritologie vor: *mab* sei "(à cause) du père". Erstens wird das Präfix *mn* = *min*, "aus, von", nie im Ugaritischen vorgefunden. Zweitens wäre noch eine hebräische Spätentwicklung *min* > *mē* in Kauf zu nehmen. Die KTU-Korrektur *mab* (*mad*) dürfte folglich zutreffen. *mad* ist dann keine Sonderschreibung fürs regelmäßige *mid* = *ma'da*, "sehr" (Z. 10), sondern ein paronomastischer G-Inf. abs. = *ma'ādu*, — zwar nicht desselben Stammes —, beim finiten Verb *tšmḥ*: "sie freue sich sehr". Der hiesige Gebrauch von *mad* ist mit dem hebräischen *harbēh* zu vergleichen.

S. 305, N. 7 (2.17,4): *luk*: ein *qatûl*-G-Part. passiv = *la'ūku* bleibt die einfachste Lösung. *lik* mit *qatila*-Perfekt ist klar transitiv in z. B. 2.14,7 und 1.4,V,42-43 (als D in 2.72,7).

S. 306, N. 9 (2.17,4): Der Brief 2.33,33-36 bietet eine ähnliche Formulierung: *bnš bnny* // *luk* ... 'm(n) *mlakty*. Auch 2.17,7 (*mlakth*) spricht für eine Ergänzung *mlakt* statt *mlk*.

S. 306-307 + N. 12 (2.17,6): *w tb' ank* bildet eine syntaktische Einheit, nämlich einen Inf. abs. nach *w*, gefolgt vom Subjekt.

S. 310 + N. 11 (2.23,22): die Energikusform *tgrn* in einem syndetischen Relativsatz zeigt in der Tat eine prekative Beimischung.

S. 319 + N. 14,16 (2.26,19-20): *al tud ad* bildet eine syntaktische Einheit, nämlich einen Jussiv (mit asseverativem oder verneinendem 'al) mit einem paronomastischen Inf. abs. desselben Stammes ('(w)d), gefolgt vom (betonten) Subjekt = 'al ta'ūd 'ādu.

S. 323-324 + N. 15 (2.30,16-19): 2x *ʾl* gehört nicht der Wurzel *ʾly*, — die Apokope ist dann unerklärlich —, sondern dem Stamm *ʾ(w)l* wie in 1.127,29 (siehe sub S. 215), G-Pf. 3m. sg. = *ʾāla*.

S. 332 + N. 22 (2.33,21): die Form *iḥd* enthält nicht die erste Person sg. von *ʾhd* (= *aḥd*), sondern einen kontrahierten Subjunktiv von *ḥdw/y*, “sich freuen”, = *ʾiḥdā* < *ʾiḥdaya*. In Note 23 behauptet der Autor mit Recht, daß hier der längste ugaritische Prosasatz begegnet (Z. 30-38).

S. 337-338 (2.33,30-38): Der Autor hat die Konstruktion mit dem Objektsatz *yrgm tmgyy* eingesehen und gut übersetzt. Es wäre nur anzumerken, daß *tmgyy* und *tʾl* vielmehr Duale sind als Plurale, da das Subjekt *alpm* ein Dual ist = *ʾalpā/ēmi*; zweitens, daß Z. 37 einen Finalsatz (*w tʾl*) enthalten kann.

S. 343 + N. 14-15 (2.34,11): *aḥš mgy* bietet in der Tat einen Objektsatz (Inf. abs. *mgy*) nach einem Hilfsverb (*ḥ(w)š*).

S. 351-356 (2.38): die ganze Übersetzung dieses Briefes geht von der Annahme aus, daß *mtt* (Z. 13) “die Hälfte” bedeutet. Da aber *tt* (Z. 23) “(ein) zweites (Schiff)” bedeutet und niemals “die andere Hälfte”, bewährt sich diese Hypothese nicht; ein angeblicher “logischer Plural” hilft nicht weiter. Folglich kann *nškh* (Z. 15) nicht dem vorhergehenden, sondern dem folgenden Passus zugeordnet werden.

S. 394-395, N. 153 und S. 402, N. 173 (2.36): ein angebliches *šnt* (in Z. 12 aber steht *sknt*, in Z. 12 *st. nt* und *štn*) kann niemals den Š-Stamm von *ytn* enthalten; das würde vielmehr *štt* = *šôtatt*- < *šnt* = *šôtant*- lauten.

S. 406: in Sachen eines vermeintlichen internen Passivs gilt die Warnung, daß gegenüber dem Ugaritischen in den späteren semitischen Sprachen diesbezügliche Formen keinen Überrest einer verschwunden, völlig ausgebildeten passiven Urbildung sind, sondern erneuernde Ansätze, die erst im klassischen Arabischen ihre Vollendung fanden.

LIBRI AD DIRECTIONEM MISSI

The following list mentions all the books on biblical and related studies sent recently to *Biblica*, including those which may not actually be reviewed in this journal. Inclusion of a book in the list is no indication of an editorial opinion concerning it.

Books sent to this journal will not be returned to the senders, even if no review of them is published in it (unless sent at the request of the editors of *Biblica*).

Books, articles and offprints from periodicals sent to *Biblica* will be made available to the editor, of the *Elenchus of Biblical Bibliography*.

Please address all books, correspondence, etc., to : Editorial Office, *Biblica*, Pontificio Istituto Biblico, Via della Pilotta, 25, I-00187 Rome, Italy.

Vetus Testamentum

Asensio, Felix, S.J., *La oración en los Salmos*. La antitesis «justo-impio» (Facultad de Teología del Norte de España 56). Burgos, Ediciones Aldecoa, 1991. 206 p. 17,8 × 25

Auneau, Joseph (et al.), *Les psaumes et les autres Ecrits* (Petite bibliothèque des sciences bibliques – Ancien Testament 5). Paris, Desclée, 1990. 476 p. 13,5 × 20,5

Barbiero, Gianni, *L'asino del nemico*. Rinuncia alla vendetta e amore del nemico nella legislazione dell'Antico Testamento (Es 23,4-5; Dt 22,1-4; Lv 19,17-18) (Analecta Biblica 128). Roma, Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1991. xi-418 p. 16,5 × 24

Brekelmans, C. – **Lust**, J. (eds.), *Pentateuchal and Deuteronomistic Studies*. Papers read at the XIIIth IOSOT Congress Leuven 1989 (BETL 94). Leuven, University Press – Leuven, Peeters, 1990. 307 p. 16 × 24. FB 1.500

Campbell, Antony F., *The Study Companion to Old Testament Literature*. An Approach to the Writings of Pre-Exilic and Exilic Israel (Old Testament Studies 2). Collegeville, The Liturgical Press, 1989. viii-540 p. 13,5 × 21,5. \$19.95

Doorly, William J., *Prophet of Justice*. Understanding the Book of Amos. Mahwah, Paulist Press, 1989. v-92 p. 21,3 × 13,5. \$5.95

Gammie, John G. – Perdue, Leo G. (eds.), *The Sage in Israel and the Ancient Near East*. Winona Lake, Eisenbrauns, 1990. xiv-545 p. 15,5 × 23,5. \$42.50

Good, Edwin M., *In Turns of Tempest. A Reading of Job with a Translation*. Stanford, Stanford University Press, 1990. xiv-496 p. 15,5 × 23,5. \$45.00

Hamilton, Victor P., *The Book of Genesis: Chapters 1–17* (The International Commentary on the Old Testament). Grand Rapids, Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1990. xviii-522 p. 14 × 22. \$27.95

Ljung, Inger, *Silence or Suppression. Attitudes towards Women in the Old Testament* (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Uppsala Women's Studies. A: Women in Religion 2). Stockholm, Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1989. 159 p. 15,5 × 22. SEK 113,—

Lohfink, Norbert, *Lobgesänge der Armen*. Studien zum Magnifikat, den Hodajot von Qumran und einigen späten Psalmen. Mit einem Anhang: Hodajot-Bibliographie 1948-1989 von Ulrich Dahmen (Stuttgarter Bibelstudien 143). Stuttgart, Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1990. 138 p. 13,5 × 21,7

Matties, Gordon H., *Ezekiel 18 and the Rhetoric of Moral Discourse* (SBL Dissertation Series 126). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1990. xi-244 p. 14 × 21,5. Cloth: \$24.95 (\$14.95); paper: \$14.95 (\$9.95)

O'Brien, Julia M., *Priest and Levite in Malachi* (SBL Dissertation Series 121). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1990. xiv-164 p. 14 × 21,5. Cloth: \$22.95 (\$14.95); paper: \$14.95 (\$9.95)

Péter-Contesse, René – Ellington, John, *A Translator's Handbook on Leviticus* (Helps for Translators). New York, United Bible Societies, 1990. ix-458 p. 16 × 23,5. \$9.50

Propp, William Henry – Halpern, Baruch – Freedman, David Noel (eds.), *The Hebrew Bible and its Interpreters* (Biblical and Judaic Studies 1). Winona Lake, Eisenbrauns, 1990. vi-225 p. 15,5 × 23,5. \$25.00

Rendsburg, Gary A., *Linguistic Evidence for the Northern Origin of Selected Psalms* (Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series 43). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1990. xiii-143 p. 15,3 × 22,7. Cloth: \$24.95 (\$14.95); paper: \$14.95 (\$9.95)

Schenker, Adrian, *Text und Sinn im Alten Testament*. Textgeschichtliche und bibeltheologische Studien (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 103). Freiburg, Universitätsverlag – Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991. 302 p. 15,5 × 23,5. SFr 75,—

Simon, Uriel, *Four Approaches to the Book of Psalms*. From Saadia Gaon to Abraham Ibn Ezra (SUNY Series in Judaica: Hermeneutics, Mysticism, and Religion). Translated from the Hebrew by Lenn J. Schramm. Albany, State University of New York Press, 1991. xii-364 p. 15,5 × 23,5. \$24.50

Smith, Mark S., *The Laments of Jeremiah and Their Contexts. A Literary and Redactional Study of Jeremiah 11–20* (Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series 42). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1990. xxi-92 p. 15,3 × 22,8

Stone, Michael Edward, *Fourth Ezra. A Commentary on the Book of Fourth Ezra* (Hermeneia – A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible). Minneapolis, Fortress Press, 1990. xxii-496 p. 21,5 × 24

Uehlinger, Christoph, *Weltreich und "eine Rede"*. Eine neue Deutung der sogenannten Turmbauerzählung (Gen 11,1-9) (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 101). Freiburg Schweiz, Universitätsverlag – Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990. xvi-629 p. 16 × 23,5. SFr 155,—

Vesco, Jean-Luc, *L'Ancien Testament. Cent ans d'exégèse à l'École Biblique* (Cahiers de la Revue Biblique 28). Paris, J. Gabalda et C^{ie}, 1990. 220 p. 15,5 × 24. FF 320

Vilchez Lindez, José, *Sabiduría. Sapienciales V* (Nueva Biblia Española). Estella, Editorial Verbo Divino, 1990. 569 p. 16 × 24

White, Hugh C., *Narration and Discourse in the Book of Genesis*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1991. xiii-312 p. 15,5 × 23,5. £35.00 - \$49.50

Novum Testamentum

Aletti, Jean-Noël, *Comment Dieu est-il juste? Clefs pour interpréter l'épître aux Romains* (Parole de Dieu). Paris, Éditions du Seuil, 1991. 285 p. 14 × 20,5. FF 130

Balaguer, Vicente, *Testimonio y tradición en San Marcos*. Narratología del segundo Evangelio. (Colección Teológica). Pamplona, Ediciones Universidad de Navarra, 1990. 250 p. 16 × 24. Ptas 2.500

Beutler, Johannes, S.J. – Fortna, Robert T. (eds.), *The Shepherd Discourse of John 10 and its Context* (Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 67). Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1991. x-172 p. 14 × 22,5. £25.50 - \$34.50

Bouttier, Michel, *L'Épître de saint Paul aux Ephésiens* (Commentaire du Nouveau Testament - Deuxième série IXb). Genève, Labor et Fides, 1991. 316 p. 17,5 × 23,7

Bruce, F.F., *The Acts of the Apostles*. Greek Text with Introduction and Commentary. Third Revised and Enlarged Edition. Grand Rapids, Eerdmans – Leicester, Apollos 1990. xxviii-569 p. 15,5 × 23,5. \$39.95

Charlier, Jean-Pierre, o.p., *Comprendre l'Apocalypse*. Tome II (Lire la Bible 90). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 1991. 283 p. 11,5 × 18. FF 109

Elliott, J. K. (ed.), *The Principles and Practice of New Testament Textual Criticism*. Collected Essays of G. D. Kilpatrick (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 96). Leuven, University Press – Leuven, Peeters, 1990. xxxviii-489 p. 15,5 × 24. FB 3000

Funk, Robert W., *New Gospel Parallels*. Vol. 1,2. The Gospel of Mark. Revised Edition (Foundations & Facets - Reference Series). Sonoma, Polebridge Press, 1990. xvi-272 p. 20,2 × 23,3. Cloth: \$21.95; paper: \$15.95

Fusco, Vittorio, *Povert  e sequela*. La pericope sinottica della chiamata del ricco (Mc. 10,17-31 parr.) (Studi Biblici 94). Brescia, Paideia Editrice, 1991. 147 p. 13,5 × 21. Lit. 18.000

Hare, Douglas R. A., *The Son of Man Tradition*. Minneapolis, Fortress Press, 1990. xiv-316 p. 15,5 × 23,5

Heininger, Bernhard, *Metaphorik, Erz hlstruktur und szenisch-dramatische Gestaltung in den Sondergutgleichnissen bei Lukas* (Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen 24). M nster, Aschendorff, 1991. vii-250 p. 16 × 24. DM 56,—

Hezser, Catherine, *Lohnmetaphorik und Arbeitswelt in Mt 20,1-16*. Das Gleichnis von den Arbeitern im Weinberg im Rahmen rabbinischer Lohngleichnisse (Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus 15). Freiburg, Universit tsverlag – G ttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990. 342 p. 15,5 × 23,5. SFr 88,—

H bner, Hans, *Biblische Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (Band 1: Prolegomena). G ttingen-Z rich, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990. 308 p. 16 × 23,5. DM 62,—

Kidd, Reggie M., *Wealth and Beneficence in the Pastoral Epistles*. A “Bourgeois” Form of Early Christianity? (SBL Dissertation Series 122). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1990. x-227 p. 14 × 21,5. Cloth: \$24.95 (\$14.95); paper: \$14.95 (\$9.95)

Kingsbury, Jack Dean, *Conflict  en Marcos*. Jes s, autoridades, disc pulos (En torno al Nuevo Testamento 10). C rdoba, Ediciones El Almendro, 1991. 170 p. 13 × 20,5

Knoch, Otto, *Der Erste und Zweite Petrusbrief. Der Judasbrief* (Regensburger Neues Testament). Regensburg, Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1990. 333 p. 14,5 × 22,5. DM 78,—

Koen, Lars, *The Saving Passion*. Incarnational and Soteriological Thought in Cyril of Alexandria’s Commentary on the Gospel according to St. John (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis - Studia Doctrinae Christianae Upsaliensia 31). Uppsala, Almqvist & Wiksell, 1991. 149 p. 15,5 × 23,5

Kuthirakkattel, Scaria, *The Beginning of Jesus’ Ministry According to Mark’s Gospel (1,14-3,6): A Redaction Critical Study* (Analecta Biblica 123). Roma, Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1990. xxvi-300 p. 16,5 × 24. Lit. 37.000

Murphy-O'Connor, Jérôme, *Le Nouveau Testament. Cent ans d'exégèse à l'Ecole Biblique (Cahiers de la Revue Biblique 27)*. Paris, J. Gabalda et Cie, 1990. vi-217 p. 15,5 × 24. FF 340

Myllykoski, Matti, *Die letzten Tage Jesu. Markus und Johannes, ihre Traditionen und die historische Frage - Band I (Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae B. 256)*. Helsinki, Suomalainen Tiedekatemia, 1991. 249 p. 16,5 × 24,5

Neumann, Kenneth J., *The Authenticity of the Pauline Epistles in the Light of Stylostatistical Analysis (SBL Dissertation Series 120)*. Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1990. x-267 p. 14 × 21,5. Cloth: \$25.95 (\$16.95); paper: \$16.95 (\$11.95)

Quesnel, Michel, *Jésus-Christ selon saint Matthieu. Synthèse théologique (Jésus et Jésus-Christ 47)*. Paris, Desclée, 1991. 239 p. 15 × 22,5. FF 119

Ralph Nutting, Margaret, *Discovering the Gospels: Four Accounts of the Good News (Discovering the Living Word Series 1)*. Mahwah, Paulist Press, 1990. vi-283 p. 15 × 23. \$11.95

Richards, E. Randolph, *The Secretary in the Letters of Paul (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament: Reihe 2; 42)*. Tübingen, Mohr, 1991. xi-251 p. 15,5 × 23. DM 98,—

Sandnes, Karl Olav, *Paul - One of the Prophets? (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament: Reihe 2; 43)*. Tübingen, Mohr, 1991. x-291 p. 15,5 × 23. DM 84,—

Taatz, Irene, *Frühjüdische Briefe. Die paulinischen Briefe im Rahmen der offiziellen religiösen Briefe des Frühjudentums (Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus 16)*. Freiburg, Universitätsverlag - Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991. 128 p. 16 × 23,5. SFr 32,—

Trummer, Peter, *Die blutende Frau. Wunderheilung im Neuen Testament*. Freiburg im Breisgau-Basel-Wien, Herder, 1991. 184 p. 12,5 × 20,3. DM 28,—

Via, Dan O., Jr., *Self-Deception and Wholeness in Paul and Matthew*. Minneapolis, Fortress Press, 1990. viii-173 p. 14 × 21,5

Wahlde, Urban C. von, *The Johannine Commandments. 1 John and the Struggle for the Johannine Tradition (Theological Inquiries)*. Mahwah, Paulist Press, 1990. xii-294 p. 13,5 × 20,5. \$13.95

Wanamaker, Charles A., *Commentary on 1 & 2 Thessalonians (New International Greek Testament Commentary)*. Grand Rapids, Eerdmans - Exeter, Paternoster Press, 1990. xxviii-316 p. 15,5 × 24. \$29.95

Witherington, Ben, *The Christology of Jesus*. Minneapolis, Fortress Press, 1990. x-310 p. 16 × 23,5

Varia

Attridge, Harold W. – Collins, John J. – Tobin, Thomas H., S.J. (eds.), *Of Scribes and Scrolls. Studies on the Hebrew Bible, Intertestamental Judaism, and Christian Origins* (Resources in Religion 5). Lanham – New York – London, University Press of America, 1990. vii-289 p. 15 × 23. Cloth: \$52.25; paper: \$33.00

Balch, David L. – Ferguson, Everett – Meeks, Wayne A. (eds.), *Greeks, Romans, and Christians. Essays in Honor of Abraham J. Malherbe*. Minneapolis, Fortress Press, 1990. xv-404 p. 16 × 23,5

Battelli, Giovanni, *Missione Apostolica. Breve storia, natura e scopo della vita consacrata nella Chiesa. Riflessioni*. Bologna, EMI, 1991. 199 p. 13 × 19. Lit. 14.000

Bruce, F.F., *A Mind for What Matters* (Collected Essays of F.F. Bruce). Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1990. x-325 p. 15 × 23. \$19.95

Coote, Robert B., *Early Israel. A New Horizon*. Minneapolis, Fortress Press, 1990. ix-197 pp. 13,5 × 21,5

Fassberg, Steven E., *A Grammar of the Palestinian Targum Fragments from the Cairo Genizah* (Harvard Semitic Studies 38). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1990. 322 p. 15,5 × 23,5. Cloth: \$39.95 (\$24.95)

Gianotto, Claudio (a cura di), *La testimonianza veritiera* (Testi del Vicino Oriente antico). Brescia, Paideia Editrice, 1990. 206 p. 13,5 × 21. Lit. 30.000

Goehring, James E. – Hedrick, Charles W. – Sanders, Jack T. – Betz, Hans Dieter (eds.), *Gnosticism & the Early Christian World*. In Honor of James M. Robinson (Forum Fascicles). Sonoma, Polebridge Press, 1990. xxiv-200 p. 15,5 × 23. \$29.95

Goehring, James E. – Hedrick, Charles W. – Sanders, Jack T. – Betz, Hans Dieter (eds.), *Gospel Origins & Christian Beginnings*. In Honor of James M. Robinson (Forum Fascicles). Sonoma, Polebridge Press, 1990. xxix-214 p. 15,5 × 23. \$29.95

González Echegaray, Joaquín, *El Creciente Fértil y la Biblia*. Estella, Editorial Verbo Divino, 1991. 311 p. 12 × 20

Keel, Othmar – Shuval, Menachem – Uehlinger, Christoph, *Studien zu den Stempelsiegeln aus Palästina/Israel. III: Die frühe Eisenzeit: Ein Workshop* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 100). Freiburg Schweiz, Universitätsverlag – Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990. xiv-455 p. xxii Tafeln. 16 × 23,5. SFr 120,—

Kelber, Werner, *Tradition orale et Écriture* (Lectio Divina 145). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf. 1991. 332 p. 13,5 × 21,5. FF 200

Kirchschläger, Walter, *Die Anfänge der Kirche*. Eine biblische Rückbesinnung. Graz – Wien – Köln, Verlag Styria, 1990, 208 p. 13 × 20,6. ÖS 198 - DM 29,80

Lohfink, Norbert, *L'alleanza mai revocata*. Riflessioni esegetiche per il dialogo tra cristiani ed ebrei (Giornale di teologia 201). Brescia, Queriniana, 1991. 101 p. 12,5 × 19,2. Lit. 12.000

Luzárraga, Jesús, *Orando con Ignacio tras Jesús*. Método de oración siguiendo a S. Ignacio de Loyola. La oración de Jesús según el Nuevo Testamento. Bilbao, Mensajero, 1991. 236 p. 22 × 15. Ptas 1.150

McDonnell, Kilian – Montague, George T., *Christian Initiation and Baptism in the Holy Spirit*. Evidence from the First Eight Centuries (A Michael Glazier Book). Collegeville, The Liturgical Press, 1991. xiv-354 p. 15 × 22,5. \$12.95

Morfinò, Mauro M., *Leggere la Bibbia con la vita*. La lettura esistenziale della Parola: un aspetto comune all'ermeneutica rabbinica e patristica. Magnano, Edizioni Qiqajon – Comunità di Bose, 1990. 192 p. 14,3 × 20,5. Lit. 20.000

Pecchioli Daddi, Franca – Polvani, Anna Maria (a cura di), *La mitologia ittita* (Testi del Vicino Oriente antico). Brescia, Paideia Editrice, 1990. 185 p. 13,5 × 21. Lit. 30.000

Peñamaría de Llano, Antonio, S.J., *El Dios de los Cristianos*. Estructura introductoria a la teología de la Trinidad (Tratado de Dios uno y trino) (Colección Síntesis 2/2). Madrid, Sociedad de Educación Atenas, 1990. 292 p. 13,5 × 21

Richardson, Peter – Westerholm, Stephen, *Law in Religious Communities in the Roman Period*. The Debate over *Torah* and *Nomos* in Post-Biblical Judaism and Early Christianity (Studies in Christianity and Judaism 4). Waterloo, Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1991. x-164 p. 15 × 22,7. \$16.95 (Canadian) - \$19.95 (US)

ISSN 0006-0887

PIETRO BOCCACCIO, Direttore Responsabile

Autorizz. Tribunale di Roma n. 6229 del 24-3-1958 del Reg. della Stampa

Finito di stampare il 31 maggio 1991
 Tipografia Poliglotta della Pontificia Università Gregoriana
 Piazza della Pilotta, 4 – 00187 Roma